CANADIAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

A Quarterly of Christian Thought

Vol. V, No. 3 July, 1959

EDITORIAL

On Being a Successful Minister — A.L.F. — 141

ARTICLES

Religious Aspects of Marxism — Paul Ramsey — 143

Visions of the End: Prophetic Eschatology — S. B. Frost — 156

The Challenge of Canadian Church History to its Historians — H. H. Walsh — 162

Perfectionism in Psychology and in Theology — W. S. Taylor — 170

The Minister as Pastor — James D. Smart — 180

Plain Talk in the Pulpit — Neil Gregor Smith — 192

BOOK REVIEWS

Hugh T. Kerr: *Mystery and Meaning in the Christian Faith* — Kenneth Hamilton — 200

Edward Cragg: *Protestant Faith and Life* — E. M. Whidden — 201

Millar MacLure: *The Paul's Cross Sermons* — G. W. Legge — 202

Godfrey Davies: *Essays on the Later Stuarts* — Gerald R. Cragg — 204

Arnold B. Rhodes: *The Church Faces the Isms* — C. C. Landon — 205

Ralph G. Turnbull: *Jonathan Edwards the Preacher* — Gerald R. Cragg — 207

A. Allan McArthur: *The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform* — Gerald E. Moffatt — 208

Seward Hiltner: *Preface to Pastoral Theology: The Ministry and Theory of Shepherding* — H. W. Buchner — 209

Everett Tilson: *Segregation and the Bible* — J. Jocz — 211

Living Age Books — John Wm. Wevers — 212

THE REV. PAUL RAMSEY, PH.D., this month became Chairman of the Department of Religion, Princeton University. He is the author of *Basic Christian Ethics* (Scribners, 1950), editor of Jonathan Edwards' *Freedom of the Will* (Yale University Press, 1952), and editor and contributor to *Faith and Ethics: the Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr* (Harper, 1957).

THE REV. STANLEY B. FROST, B.A., M.TH., PH.D., is Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, McGill University, Montreal.

THE REV. W. S. TAYLOR, PH.D., D.D., is Principal of the Union College, Vancouver, of the United Church of Canada. He is Professor of the Philosophy of Religion and a former missionary in India.

THE REV. H. H. WALSH, M.A., S.T.M., PH.D., is Associate Professor of Church History in the Faculty of Divinity, McGill University, Montreal. He is the author of *The Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1956).

THE REV. JAMES D. SMART, PH.D., D.D., was minister of Rosedale Presbyterian Church, Toronto, until 1957, when he became Professor of Biblical Interpretation in Union Seminary, New York.

THE REV. NEIL GREGOR SMITH, M.A., is Librarian at Knox College, Toronto, and Archivist of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

WE INVITE CONTRIBUTIONS, which should be addressed to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee. MSS should be typewritten, double spaced, and proof-read before being submitted. Notes should be gathered at the end of articles, with appropriate references. No MS will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

THE JOURNAL is recognized as a charitable organization for Canadian income tax purposes. Financial contributions, other than the amount paid for subscription, may be deducted from the donor's income, when calculating tax. Donations are urgently needed if the price of the JOURNAL is to be kept within the means of all subscribers.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE should be sent to Mrs. G. K. Montizambert, Secretary of the Board of Directors, Appleby College, Oakville. Cheques in connection with the business of the JOURNAL (except for subscriptions) should be made out to The Canadian Journal of Theology, Incorporated, payable at par in Toronto.

SUBSCRIPTIONS should be sent to the University of Toronto Press, Toronto 5. Cheques in payment of subscriptions should be made out to University of Toronto Press, payable at par in Toronto.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Regular		*Students*	
One Year	$3.00	One Year	$1.50
Two Years	$5.00	Two Years	$3.00

Single issues $1.00

Editorial

ON BEING A SUCCESSFUL MINISTER

IN his book *The Death of Christ* James Denney observed that we would only approach the ideal church when our "evangelists were theologians" and our "theologians were evangelists." One wonders how much support could be mustered for Denney's thesis in the membership and ministry of the Church today?

Evangelism and theology have all too often been alienated from each other and in their alienated state have been rejected by large numbers of the working ministry. Hence there has arisen in the Church the spectacle of a large body of clergymen who are neither evangelists nor theologians. We have now the category of the working minister who is busily engaged in making the local congregation thrive. He is caught up in an activism that makes him work to the point of nervous exhaustion in order to show a statistical increase for the record book. The quality of his work is judged on the basis of comparative figures from year to year. Seldom has the clergyman time to ask in all of this busy productivity, "To what end?" The most serious problem that faces the busy minister today is to find time to study and to reflect on the meaning of the gospel and the nature of the Church and so keep all the "busyness" of the ministry in proper perspective.

Clergymen, however, should not be asked to bear all the blame for this situation. The demands of congregations and sometimes of denominational leaders is that the ministry should be successful, and success is judged frequently by the current standards of success in the secular world, *bigness*, "*busyness*" and *affluence*. When such pressures are put on the clergyman, already overworked because of inadequate assistance and striving to manage an over organized Church, a subtle shift can take place in his thinking. His own objectives of Christian ministry are changed from the cultivation of costly commitment to Christ, encouragement of an energetic discipleship of the cross-bearing type, and serious reflection on the meaning of the service of a God of Love and Righteousness, towards the creation of a happy, well adjusted religious organization whose chief reason for existence is to meet the superficial needs of a people who are no longer anxious to hear the judging, saving Word of God.

These pressures which have forced the minister to spend more time in administration, organization and office counselling and less time in his study and in pastoral visitation, must be examined for what they are. People have real, demanding and legitimate needs and the clergyman must seek to meet them with the best resources at his disposal. His ministry is carried on, however, not only in conversation with a demanding world but in conversa-

tion with the God who has called him to minister to the needs of the world as He Himself in infinite Wisdom perceives them. Conversation with the world about him does not give the clergyman a true insight into the real needs of his people unless his conversation with God gives insights and perspectives which will enable him to assess them properly. A thoughtful, theological, biblical approach to the task of the ministry must always be taken if one is to avoid the very real dangers that confront the ministry today.

How long the Church can survive this activist, administrator concept of the ministry no one can say. We are prepared to venture, however, that if our generation will not come to grips with the crying needs of our time and seek to answer them by serious theological effort and agony of spirit, we shall bequeath our problems to a generation after us who will then be forced to answer out of the physical agony and enslavement of a world that was not served with the liberating gospel of Life.

Prior to the Reformation in the 16th century there were many voices raised against the prevailing and generally accepted patterns of ecclesiastical thought and practice. There were few who would listen. A whole new world was being born in the late medieval period and the Church by and large was oblivious to the import of the times. Small wonder that the Reformation movement shattered the complacency of the Church with revolutionary violence. God will wait for no one. If His Church will not come to grips with the issues of life by her own disciplined theological and biblical studies then God will force her to think of them in minority, if not illegal, groups that once more she may become a true witness to His Name.

A.L.F.

Religious Aspects of Marxism

PAUL RAMSEY

KARL MARX wrote that the criticism of religion is the beginning of all criticism. "Criticism of heaven is transformed into a criticism of the earth, criticism of religion into the criticism of the law, criticism of theology into the criticism of politics."

Marx's understanding of religion derives from the left-wing Hegelian Feuerbach, and it is what we commonly call today the theory of projection. In religion man alienates from himself something belonging properly to his own human essence, denies that this quality belongs to himself, and projects it upon the infinite. He dispossesses himself in order to have a god who has great possessions. Thus "The poor man possesses a rich God." Man finds himself "dispossessed of something essentially belonging to him for the benefit of an illusive reality." He "affirms in God what he denies in himself." He compensates for the fact that he is impoverished, or he impoverishes himself by enriching his God, in filling whom he empties himself. This has not been altogether a bad thing, Feuerbach says, since "strictly speaking, consciousness exists only in beings which can make their [own] essence and their species the object of thought." For a long time the religious contemplation of the essence of God has been the only manner in which man had self-consciousness or consciousness of his own essence "writ large" in the heavens. Tribute to the greatness of God has been a testimony to man's awareness of the greatness of man, since God is only the sum total of the attributes which make up the greatness of man. Perhaps this has been a necessary historical form of human self-consciousness. But the time has now come for man to "take back into his heart that nature which he has rejected," for him to recover what he has projected, for him to come into his own. The original title planned for Feuerbach's *Das Wesen des Christentums* was *Gnothi seauton* (know thyself).

Marx's only reproach of Feuerbach is for thus making religious self-alienation and projection some sort of strange metaphysical act or an isolated human act, instead of explaining it more positively and concretely in terms of sociological and economic facts. Otherwise he accepts and applies Feuerbach's analysis of religion. "Man makes religion;" he writes, "it is not religion that makes man; religion is in reality man's own consciousness and feeling which has not yet found itself or has lost itself again." "The religion of the workers has no God, because it seeks to restore the divinity of man." Or his more famous statement: "This state and this society produce religion, a mistaken attitude to the world, because they themselves constitute a false world. . . . [Religion] is the imaginative realization of the human essence, because that essence has no reality. The misery of religion is at once the

expression of real misery and also a protestation against actual misery. Religion is the sigh of the harassed creature (the sigh of a creature overwhelmed by unhappiness), the spirit of spiritless circumstances (the soul of a world that has no heart, as it is the mind of an era that has no mind). It is the opiate of the people. . . . Religion is only the illusory sun which moves around man so long as man does not move around himself."

With this view of religion it does not much matter to the orthodox Marxist whether the war is currently being prosecuted against organized religion or whether religious observances are momentarily tolerated while the war is being prosecuted against the social conditions which seem to make them necessary. The result will be the same, for as Marx wrote, "The demand that one reject illusions about one's situation is a demand that one reject a situation which has need for illusion." This may also be read in the other direction: The demand that one reject a situation which has need for illusion is a demand that one reject illusions about one's situation. Thus the criticism of religion is the beginning of all criticism in such a way that it does not much matter which end of the stick you first take hold of. To prosecute the war against economic exploitation may be the best way to attack religion, for it may equally well be said that the criticism of earth is transformed into a criticism of heaven, the criticism of the law into the criticism of religion, the criticism of politics into the criticism of theology.

Thus the Marxist movement in the mid-19th century announced that the criticism of religion is the beginning of all criticism of politics and economics. It may be worthwhile for us in the mid-20th century to consider whether the beginning of all criticism of Marxism itself may not be the criticism of the religious aspects of Marxism. By "criticism," of course, I do not mean total or partial rejection, but the proper *understanding* of Marxism. Middleton Murry has said that "Communism is the one living religion in the world today." Rightly grasped, Marxism must be studied as also a religious movement, and not merely as a scientific or philosophical system. There are enough obscurities and inconsistencies in Marxism as a social science to prepare anyone for the conclusion that only a religion could have brought such errors to considerable triumph in the world. Perhaps we may even say that, as Marxism as an ideology endeavors to satisfy all the religious urges of men, its claim to be scientific is a necessary prerequisite in the modern age, for without pretending to be scientific men in our day would not even be religious.

Of course, objectively viewed, Marxism is not a religion, since it has no place for belief in God, no point of reference to reality transcending the human and historical plane; and from this point of view it may seem foolish to speak of the religious aspects of Marxism. But, subjectively viewed, Marxism is but one more proof that Plato was right in describing man as "that most religious of animals." Even atheism, when it succeeds in becoming a vital movement, is informed by genuine religious components. To say

that when subjectively viewed Marxism may be regarded as a religious movement, is to call attention first of all to the fact that men give to it their final loyalty, their absolute allegiance. They find in it their ground of ultimate concern, the resting place and warrant for their faith and hopes. They are engaged in it in such a way that all other concerns are either excluded or fall into subordinate place. In so far as Luther's words are to be credited, "Trust and Faith of the heart alone make both God and the idol. Whatsoever thy heart clings to and relies upon, that is properly thy God," Marxism may surely be said to have its fundamental religious aspect.

Yet there is more analogy between Marxism and religion than this matter of the faith or commitment each evokes. The *faith*-element cannot actually be separated from the *thought*-element in either Marxism or religion. We may expect therefore to find many striking comparisons between the structures of thought and the world-views of Marxism and of the biblical religions. How could this be otherwise, since it was the religious urges of specifically Western man which Marxism as an ideology endeavored to satisfy and redirect? It naturally sucks back into the human essence, and onto the plane of history, all that had been lost from humanity to the specifically biblical Deity. One ought not to forget that, when a grammar school boy, Karl Marx wrote a treatise entitled "The Union of the Faithful with Christ, according to John 15: 1–14, in its Ground and its Essence, its Conditioned Necessity and its Effects." His mother is said once to have remarked that things would be better if only Karl didn't write so much about Capital and made some of it! She might have been sure that in writing about religion and about almost everything else, he had a good deal of it—not simply "religion in general" (which does not exist) but the particular religious convictions of men in the West stemming from the Bible. Indeed, since the break-up of Calvinism, Marxism is almost the only biblical theology which has effectively moulded the thought of ordinary men.

Consider first the religious source or the religious equivalent of some of the characteristics of life in the present age, as Marxism describes it.

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle." What can be more irreligious than this? Yet if we let the religious doctrine of the Fall of man have for a moment its proper place in our thinking, we shall find nothing inherently unlikely in the Marxist account of history as the history of class struggle. Assuming sinfulness, it may be quite plausible to argue that man's life now is conditioned by his greed and self-interest. Both Marxism and Christianity apparently affirm that man is alienated from himself, from his natural environment, from true community with his fellows. Granting this, the wonder is not that Marxism unfolds the story of mankind as a history of the struggle of man against man, but that it limits this struggle to classes. St. Augustine was more realistic and thoroughgoing. For him the kingdoms of this earth are built up out of an uncertain order and an unjust peace imposed upon inveterate strife and dissension. Cain,

the first murderer was also the first builder of cities. He is the founder of the *civitas terrena*. This is a symbol for the fact that the kingdoms of men in this historical time are built upon fratricide. Of course, the transcendent reference in St. Augustine's view makes all the difference. There is for him a city—the city of God—in which men unite in love for an eternal good in whom men need not fear to have colleagues. It is because men do not seek the *summum bonum et commune* that they are alienated from themselves and one another. In inordinate love for earthly goods, in enjoying which men *must* fear to have colleagues, they base their lives on dissension and implicit fratricide. Their normal condition is war—within themselves and against others. But lopping off the religious reference to transcendent reality, as Marxism does, and viewing history, so to speak, from the underside, the resulting account of the primacy of strife is not so unlike that of the Augustinian tradition in Christianity—only St. Augustine was even more realistic.

Next, the role and function of the state. We ought not at once simply to say that the state is an instrument of the dominant class. This it is in any epoch, but throughout them all the state has a more general function. In Engels's words: "in order to prevent these antagonisms—classes with conflicting interests—from consuming themselves and society in fruitless struggle, a power seemingly above society has become necessary which is to mitigate the conflict, to keep it within the bounds of 'order'; and this power, originating in society but placing itself above society and alienating itself more and more from it, is the state." Since the antagonisms which the state restrains have their source in the original alienation and dispossession of man, we may say that the state serves to restrain and remedy the original sin or disintegration of the human essence. This was precisely the function assigned the state in Augustinian Christianity until St. Thomas gave it also a more positive purpose, and again this is the role of the state in Lutheranism: to build a dyke against sin and chaos. It is only because the state generally is an instrument to keep society going in its present form, that it thus becomes in any *given* age an instrument which serves to formalize and perpetuate the existing class structure and property relationships, and therefore becomes automatically beneficial to the ruling classes. In this sense only does it turn into an "executive committee" of these classes.

Next, Marxist materialism and economic determinism. This is often wrongly supposed to be the polar opposite of religion, which in contrast, it is said, teaches the power of pious ideals and the ascendency of spiritual over material things. It may be that in rejecting religion along with idealism, Marxism has misread religion, or at least biblical religion, with which it has close kinship. The material facts of life and the economic and political elements in history are of peculiar concern to the Bible. William Temple remarked that "Christianity is the most materialistic religion in the world." This language is perhaps too extreme, since it, too, omits to mention the transcendent point of reference in every religion. We might say, however,

that biblical religion consists of a this-worldly other-worldliness—or if that is too paradoxical a phrase, that biblical religion is the most incarnational religion in the world, which places a stamp of approval or endorsement upon the concrete and the material facts of life. "It is no part of the Christian thesis," writes Alexander Miller, "that ideals have been more powerful in history than brute facts: as if God were able to manipulate ideas, but a bit helpless when it came to the sphere of the material and the economic, so that to acknowledge the power of hunger and class-interest and natural or biological causes would be to rob Him of His prerogatives"[1] to a greater extent than by acknowledging man's actions to be determined by ideas and ideals.

This is a difficult point for me to make, for it happens that I hold another philosophical view of human nature. Yet I have to admit that what the Bible affirms is not the primacy of the spiritual over the material, or the power of ideals in history, but the rule of God over all. It affirms that "God comes first, and not man," but it is not the least concerned to argue that thought precedes the act in man's individual and historical existence. It is not in the least concerned to prove that man is a thinking soul-substance. Where *Genesis* states that God breathed into man the breath of life and he became a "living soul," the word is *nephesh* which should be translated "living being." It is also used of the animals: they too are living beings, and man is like them in his life. Where the New Testament asks, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" the word *psyche* is a translation of *nephesh* rather than understandable in one of the Greek meanings of *psyche*. The verse should read, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own life?" Do we feel that something of the inspiration and the spirituality has gone out of it when the verse is so read? Yes, indeed it has: the idealism has gone out of it, and religion as other-worldliness. While Marxism departs significantly from the Bible in denying the importance of the Divine appointment to which man is called, it carries on the biblical emphasis upon the historical and material setting in which human life is placed. Materialistic determination may be wrong, but to replace it by the power of ideas would not necessarily bring us a hair's breadth closer to the way the Bible understands God to rule in human affairs.

Next, the Marxist passion for social justice and for the humanization of dehumanized, exploited people. In the words of Karl Marx describing the misery of these present times, it is quite impossible not to hear ringing again the prophetic protest of an Amos of Tekoa: "There came a time when everything that men had considered inalienable became an object of exchange, of traffic, and could be alienated. This is the time when the very things which till then had been communicated but never exchanged, given but never sold, acquired but never bought—virtue, love, conviction, knowl-

1. Alexander Miller, *The Christian Significance of Karl Marx*, (New York: Macmillan, 1952), p. 88.

edge, conscience, etc.—when everything passed into commerce. It is the time of general corruption, of universal venality, or, to speak in terms of political economy, the time when everything, moral or physical, having become a marketable value, is brought to the market to be assessed at its truest value. . . ." Capitalism has "dissolved all natural-organic relationships into money relationships." "The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his 'natural superiors', and has left no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, and callous 'cash payment.' " Or as the college girl said after her boy friend had spent fifty dollars on her in one evening, "I think I *owe* him something." Thus the inalienable person herself became an object of exchange; and things formerly communicated but never exchanged, given but never sold, acquired but never bought, pass over into commerce. Marx stands squarely in the line of the prophets and the conscience of the west. His is one mighty protest against the bartering of people. Middleton Murry says rightly that Marxism alone does not explain Marx himself, his passion for social justice, his prophetic faith.

We can see Marx's concern for the *human relations* behind economic relations—in, with and under them—more precisely and at particular points in his thought. This is true, I believe, even of that most abstract thought tracing all determination home to "the relations of production" in any society. What does this expression mean, "the relations of production?" Are the relations of production ever simply economic relations and not also human relations? Marx scathingly condemns what he calls "commodity-fetishism," and calls up the wrath of an immanent deity against a world in which the social relations of production and all human relationships in general have turned into exchange relationships. Behind every commodity relation lurks a human relation.

Again, one cannot rightly grasp the "labor theory of value" in Marxist theory just by assessing its validity or invalidity as an economic theory. Rather, one must take into account the century-old justification of the right to appropriate personal property that goes back through John Locke and Thomas Aquinas to Aristotle. Thus, the labor theory of value has its rootage both in classical humanism and in the Christian humanism of the middle ages; and for this reason Marx has been called the last of the school-men. Briefly, the labor theory of property is that man gains a right of possession by the labor he puts forth into the state of nature. He extends his personality in mastering the earth and it becomes his. Whatever he puts his own person into belongs to him. To dispossess him of it is to dispossess him of a part of himself. It is a striking and interesting fact that what is at the root of the positive moral justification of private property in western thought is also at the root of the moral justification of communism—the labor theory of value—and that the argument used for communism against capitalism in the modern period is continuous with the argument

Aristotle used for private property against Plato's communism. Market value and commodity fetishism under capitalism, according to the Marxist analysis, deprive the laborer of what belongs to him, and accomplish the final stage in the alienation of man from himself, just as theft or expropriation threatens human values in a private property system. Marxism says in effect that there needs to be less private monopoly-property in order that there can be more private property of the sort that really counts, in order that a man may not be deprived of what is his, the value of his labor and the product he puts himself into. For this reason "I think I could undertake to compile two columns of extracts about property, the one taken from Marxist text-books and the other exclusively from the various Papal Encyclicals on the Social Order, and defy anyone to tell from which source they respectively came. This is because the fundamental 'right to private property' which Catholic doctrine insists on has nothing to do with the bourgeois monopoly in property against which the Communist Manifesto —like the Encyclicals—was directed."[2] Something like this was done a few years ago by Rep. Hays to the consternation of a witness before the Reese committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Next, consider the remarkable agreement between that great fulcrum of Marxist criticism—the concept of ideology—and the great fulcrum and critical perspective upon human affairs contained in the Christian notion of sin. Ideology means that self-interest and class-interest or one's *locus* in the system of production determines and corrupts what one *thinks* about ethics and politics and law, the arts and religion and every other cultural activity created by man in every period. One might even say that these higher expressions of the human spirit are, for the Marxist, *totally* corrupt; and recall the story of the Calvinist who secured the advantage over an Anglican by declaring, "You are only a 'miserable offender', while I'm totally depraved!" The lack of any transcendent point of reference, however, deprives the Marxist of any capacity for *self*-criticism. He cannot, or does not, apply the concept of ideology to himself or to as radical a suspicion of the ideas and ideals and politics of the working-class movement as to other folk's ideology. By contrast, properly understood the fulcrum of the religious doctrine of the sinfulness or corruption of even (or especially) the highest reaches of the human spirit makes for confession of one's own sin before God and, as Luther said, throws the mantle of charity over the sin or the self-interested ideology of others. This provides ground both for seeking to see the truth and not only the error in the midst of the ideas and ideals of people who because of their own special location in history or in the class structure look out upon the whole with different eyes than ours, and also for more self-criticism of the ideas and ideals, the philosophy and politics, of our own group. But, for all the difference, the religious point of view makes common cause with the probing concept of ideology, and similar criticism of the purity of reason put forward, e.g., by psychology in the modern

2. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

period; or rather, religion in the tradition of the Bible affirms that these discoveries are not so new and that all along this was known and summarized in the concept of the sinfulness of the whole man.

When we go beyond these comparisons of details, and consider the Marxian and the Christian philosophies of history as a whole, it is remarkable how alike they are. Consider, first, the Marxist unshakable belief in progress and how this functions in his thought as a surrogate for the belief in providence. This is so remarkable a feature of Communist faith that when, nearly a generation ago now, the Christian philosopher John Macmurray, of the University of London, first began to study Marxism sympathetically with a view toward effecting an intellectual rapprochement between it and Christianity, he suggested that perhaps only the Marxist really believes any longer in God's providential rule over human history.

> The Communist lives by a faith in a power, which he calls in his own jargon 'the process of history'. . . . This simply means that Communism, whatever its exponents may say, has recovered that essential core of a real belief in God, which organized Christianity has in our day largely lost.
>
> Anyone who concluded that the behaviour of the Christians showed that they did not really believe in God but only thought they believed, might then equally conclude that the Communists really believed in God and only thought they did not.
>
> There would be nothing paradoxical in the discovery that a religion which had lost its faith in God must be overwhelmed by a faith which had rejected religion. (*Creative Society*).

Do we really believe in God, or—in the revised oath of allegiance to the United States, for example—do we only believe in believing in God?

Of course, the Marxian dialectical progress toward the new age which is the final goal of history removes the transcendent reference from the doctrine of providence, and places faith in a wholly immanent power. This is a significant difference, often too much overlooked by Marxist Christians. Nevertheless, Marxism does represent a continuation of the belief that linear, temporal history and all the events that happen upon this plane have basic significance—a belief which goes back as far as the ninth century B.C. to the earliest strand that found its way into the Pentateuch, the Yahwist writer's account of God's dealings with the generations of men. What happens here and now has a past and will have a future; the present arises out of memory of God's mighty acts in the past and leans forward in expectancy toward what God (or the process of history) is yet about to do; every event and each generation has a heritage and a destiny that falls within some overarching "purpose" being worked out in time, without which we have not properly understood "the time of our lives." To grasp history as a meaningful field of activity—as event-full—it is necessary to speak of both the *terminus from which* every event comes and the *terminus toward which* it is tending. Plato, in the doctrine of creation and the creation of time as the relation between and measure of the motion of creatures, had a *terminus from which*, and to this extent spatio-temporal events had their meaning. But, lacking an eschatology or view of the *end toward which*

temporal history was moving, events were not as meaningful for him as for the prophetic tradition in biblical religion. Consequently, Plato describes time as at best "a moving image of eternity." In it there takes place participation in the eternal or imitation of the heavenly essences. In their biographies individual men and societies may advance toward fuller comprehension and expression of these eternal verities, but each generation stands as close to them as any other. Time and history are not themselves moving toward any consummation. Marxism displays its true parentage when it comes into the world with the exuberant and frightening cry, "Now is our salvation nearer than the hour we first believed." In this the prophets still speak, with their conviction that the Eternal has moved purposefully into history, bending it, and the men who adhere to its grain, toward some appointed terminus in an age beyond the present.

Events in time are of more consequence than the passing shadows on the wall of Plato's cave. Instead they are the very plane upon which human destiny is being wrought out. This ingredient which Marxism shares with the western tradition generally accounts for the fact, that until they are touched by the life and thought of the West, the depressed classes in other religious cultures are simply depressed, while among us they are depressed *into expectancy*. However fantastic be the forms of the expectation that something revolutionary and transforming is about to happen in history, western man—and the Marxians no less than others—live by faith and are saved by hope. The worse the visible situation becomes, the harder the heel of the oppressor, the more evident is it that the powers of evil and injustice are being mustered for their last Armageddon. Or, as a line of the *Internationale* puts it: "Then, Comrades, come rally, and the *last* fight let us face."

Now, the biblical view of history and the Marxian belief in an immanent providence, which we have so far considered only in general terms, both break down into an articulate structure of successive periods. The analogy between their conception of these ages suggests still more strongly the prophetic and biblical component in Marxism. Biblical religion speaks of various "dispensations"—the garden of Paradise, the Fall of man into history as we know it, then the periods from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Moses, from Moses to Christ, and finally with quickening pace from Christ to the second coming of the Messiah. The word "dispensations" contains, of course, a reference to transcendent reality, to the free disposing purpose of the living God, which drops out in Marxism. But Marxism does have the structural equivalents of these ages in its view of history: primitive communism, the fall of man from this ideal state into slavery, then feudalism, then capitalism in which the Messianic class appears at first incognito among the common people, then revolutionary upheaval seizes the present age thrusting down the mighty from their seats, and the Kingdom of God or the final communism is ushered in through an intermediary period of socialism.

There is surely more to the Marxian conception of a golden age of primitive communism than was supplied by the researches of Lewis Morgan, the American anthropologist, among the Iroquois Indians. The more is Rousseau's *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality.* The more also is the Garden of Eden symbol. To this it might be objected that Marxism portrays primitive communism by no means as a Paradise in which the first pair have only to tend the garden at leisure, but as a hard and perilous life in which mankind is slain all the day long by the forces of nature; and also that it pictures the Fall as increased mastery of nature. However, in certain respects theology has always interpreted the Fall as a fall upward. And in any case looking back upon it religious people have been inclined to "praise the sin" upon which precondition so great redemption has been wrought, much as Marxism pays tribute to the achievement of greater mastery over nature during historical ages since the Fall. Thus, the final communism is superior to primitive communism, as the Kingdom of God is to the original paradise, by virtue of what has gone between. And for all the hardship, in primitive communism man was still man, in full possession of his humanity, in spite of the fact that he—integral man—succumbed all the day long before the alien forces of nature. Though he died easily, nothing had yet alienated him from himself or dehumanized him. In primitive society, production was on the narrowest possible scale, but, to quote Engels, "it entailed the producers' mastery over their *processe* of production and its product. . . . As long as production is carried on on this basis it cannot grow over the producers' heads, cannot beget any monstrous foreign power facing them, as is regularly and inevitably the case in civilization." In short, while under primitive communism man was not much the master of physical nature, he was the master of his own productive processes. After the Fall he gains mastery over nature only at the expense of being enslaved to his own means of production. These "grow over his head," and become a "monstrous foreign power facing him."

This is the first great alienation of man which lies behind, or underneath, man's life in all later periods of history. Man is dispossessed of his full human stature, he is dehumanized, by the growth of the processes of production "over his head." This is, in Marxist mythology, the "original sin" of man in history as we know it. To grasp the parallel with biblical religion, we must not interpret "original sin" as an isolated action done, but also as a wounding of his human substance which man suffers. This wound, of course, he inflicts on himself. By sin comes slavery to sin, Christians say. And by putting forth himself into the processes of production there comes, say the Marxists, as a consequence man's own dispossession of himself when these grow over his head and face him as monstrous power. The original sin of man the historical animal means the distortion of the human essence under the conditions by which alone his freedom and economic power in the world were actualized. It is the alienation of man from

his true nature, his self-alienation from himself. This, according to both Marxism and Christianity, has "always already" happened.

With Paradise and the Fall behind us, let us turn now and face toward the Kingdom of God to which the present age is rapidly drawing near. The Marxist analysis unfolds before us some remarkable expectations. This is an age of Messianic woes. The present age groaneth and travaileth waiting for the sons of God. A Messiah is expected who will bring division, setting father against son and son against father. Indeed, he may even now be present among us hidden among the common people. Perhaps he is already laid in a manger in some stable among the sons of the poor; and thence about to take up his work and assume his rightful sovereignty over the kingdoms of this world. The Messiah, of course, is the working-class come to self-consciousness as the proletariat. They will save Israel and usher in the Kingdom of God and wipe away all tears from our eyes.

Now what the Marxist says about this Messiah is quite paradoxical. He is not the Messiah you would have expected. We have already noticed that the Marxist confidence in the rationality and competence of working-class thoughts contradicts, or at least limits the application of, the concept of ideology. But notice the description of the qualifications of this Messiah emerging within the historical process. In the proletariat the self-alienation and dehumanization of man reaches its most extreme development. The working-class is utterly alienated from essential humanity, hence able to overcome alienation; dehumanized, hence ready to carry the torch for humanity. The class-consciousness of the proletariat is actually the class-consciousness of man the *commodity*, the consciousness of men who have already been crucified, dead, and buried as men. How can the manhood of the industrial worker, being so alienated from its own human nature, have it within itself to achieve its own emancipation, and at the same time the final salvation of mankind? By its position in history and in the processes of production, the proletariat constitutes a society all by itself, as it were, thrust outside of bourgeois society. It is a counter-society to the existing order, a universal class, a class to end all classes. Totally negated by the existing system it becomes the total negation of that system, and therefore a total summation of human protest against partial humanity. It is a complete expression and veritable incarnation of humanity. Hence it has complete detachment from the ideology of class interest set against other classes within society. Thoroughly dehumanized, it thereby becomes the bearer of the new being, the new humanity, humanity for the first time since the Fall, essential humanity saved from the distortions that held sway during all former periods of history.

Must we not think in this connection of the crucified, suffering Messiah of another celebrated religion? He, too, was thrust altogether "outside the camp," was crucified, dead and buried; yet rises again to new life and obtains the renewal of all mankind. He grew up before us

> Like a root out of dry ground;
> he had no form or comeliness that we should look at him,
> and no beauty that we should desire him.
> He was despised and rejected by men;
> a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;
> and as one from whom men hide their faces.
> he was despised, and we esteemed him not . . .
> yet we esteemed him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted.

Yet he was the new being, the bearer of a new humanity, himself the new being and the new humanity, true man of true man, the saviour of the world.

> But he was wounded for our transgressions,
> he was bruised for our iniquities;
> upon him was the chastisement that made us whole,
> And with his stripes we are healed (Isaiah 53:2–5).

It has frequently been suggested that the final stage of perfect communism corresponds to the Kingdom of God. Let us see just how this is so, for Marxist terminology now shifts to accord with the nature of so great a consummation. We have not yet been speaking of history. History only now has its beginning. All that went before was pre-history. Likewise, the human being for the first time appears before our expectant eyes. All that went before was pre-human. As Engels wrote "a truly human ethic, standing above class contradictions and above the memory of them, will be possible only on a stage of development in society which has not only overcome the antinomy of class, but also has forgotten it for the practice of life." The lion shall lie down with the lamb and the infant shall play a flute before the hole of an asp, and a little child shall lead them. The state shall wither away, for there will be no more of the alienation of man from man or antagonism of class against class for it to restrain and remedy in order to preserve a just, endurable peace among opposites. The church also—that is, the Communist Party—shall wither away; and no longer shall one person say to another, "Let us go up to the house of the Lord;" but each shall dwell under his own vine and a fig tree and each for himself shall know and do what is for the general good.

Since Marxism takes *time* seriously and emphasizes the meaning of pre-history as it grinds violently from one stage of the dialectic to another, the final Paradise cannot be regarded as a heaven static and at rest. The dialectic of thesis, antithesis and synthesis continues, only now it works smoothly and by discussion and persuasion. Under communism there is *activity in* the goal, pre-history has been *activity toward* the goal. This is exactly what Christian theologians say about the vision of God in eternal life. Taking *time* seriously as a relation among creatures and the measure of the activity of creatures, and emphasizing the meaning of historical events, it then becomes quite impossible for the biblical religions to conceive of an altogether timeless eternity. As long as there are creatures whose individuality and actions have ultimate significance, it will take time to be their measure,

only time redeemed from the agony of unfulfillment. There will be activity in the goal and a time beyond present history spent in adhering to God—eternal life in peace, peace in eternal life. We have the same thing in the attenuation of dialectical movement in the Marxist heaven, only there is no God there.

Jettisoning the religious reference to transcendent reality means that the Marxist attitude toward the components of pre-history must be one of total rejection and total revolution. Marxism does not accept, as Augustine said of the Manichees, "with good and simple faith this good and simple reason why the good God created" such a world as this—that for all the evil corrupting it, its basic nature still is good. Instead "everything," writes Engels, "that is real within the realm of the history of mankind is bound to become unreasonable after a while; hence it is already by definition unreasonable, is afflicted with unreasonableness from the very beginning. . . . Everything that exists deserves to perish." In other words, in the present stage of pre-human history, the unreasonable is the real and the real is the wholly unreasonable. On the other hand, in the final days the reasonable is destined to become real and all reality reasonable. "Everything,"writes Engels, "that is reasonable within the heads of men is destined to become real, however much it may contradict the existing seeming reality."

You notice in this the Hegelian terminology of an immanent rational spirit in nature and history. Marx claimed he overturned Hegelianism and stood Hegel on his feet again, the feet of dialectical materialism. But Hegel was already bending over clutching his toes, the curvature of the body in that position being a symbol for his philosophy of immanent spirit or rationality. When Marx turned Hegel over, his posture was not much altered, since the system still manifests the structures of immanentism. These are the critical points of Maxism, for example, its failure to find firm moral grounds for *not* using individual men "to manure the soil for the future harmony," for the time to come when the reasonable shall become real. Today there is perhaps good ground for believing, with Gabriel Marcel, that "all philosophies of immanence have had their day." Yet point by point within the limits of a wholly immanent scheme, Marxism evidently provides a religion to end religion by offering viable substitutes for the specific articulated structures of biblical or prophetic religious faith on which it largely depends for its power.

Visions of the End: Prophetic Eschatology*

S. B. FROST

THE good old days" is a phrase which we do not hear very often now. Most people, looking back to the times before there were public hospitals and old age pensions, a dependable police force and impartial law courts, are not tempted to call them the "good old days." Yet we are perhaps only the second or third generation to think that the future is going to better than the past—and even we have our doubts. Throughout its long history, the human race has tended to look back nostalgically rather than to look forward hopefully. "Times aren't what they used to be" has been the usual regretful comment. To teach mankind to look forward rather than backward has been one of the most important and difficult tasks of the Hebrew people and of the Bible they wrote.

If we examine the thought of ancient Egypt or Mesopotamia or even early Greece, we find no hopeful expectation of the future. Rather, life was conceived to be a great cycle in which one age follows another in rotation, just as the seasons follow one another through the circling year. Men thought of the *Annus Magnus* or Great Year, in which the Golden Age was succeeded by the Silver, Bronze and Iron Ages, so that in the full circle the Golden Age would return again. There is a sobering implication in the fact that men always reckoned themselves to be living in the Iron Age—and if I had said it was an "ironical" fact I would only have been using language which we have inherited from this kind of thinking.

Now where the Hebrews were distinctive in the Ancient World is that mentally they broke that circle and stretched it out into a straight line. The existence of this world, they said, began somewhere and is going somewhere. In time, we are not just going round and round in circles, but we are on the march. There was a beginning to the journey of mankind and one day there will be an end.

How the Hebrews—alone, as far as we can discover—came to make this tremendous change in mental outlook is a fascinating question, but what we must notice is that as a result of this thought-revolution, the Hebrews invented two things: History and Eschatology. The Hebrews were writing history (that is, the story of their past told in such a way as to bring out its significance for their own day and for the future) four hundred years before Herodotus the first Greek historian took up the task, and they were doing so because they believed that God was working out a plan or purpose,

*A paper prepared for delivery over the Trans-Canada network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation on Wednesday, March 5, 1959, in the series "The Bible Today," which was sponsored by the Editorial Committee of the *Canadian Journal of Theology*.

and that a review of their own past would reveal what that purpose was, and also how it would finally be fulfilled. So they did not invent history only, they also stumbled upon eschatology. Eschatology is a word which comes from the Greek *eschatos* meaning "last." Eschatology is the teaching about what is going to happen at the last day. For the very fact that they thought of history as the outworking of the purpose of God meant that, when that purpose was fulfilled, history would come to an end. "In the beginning, God" has as its inevitable corollary, "*in the end*, God." So now we have to ask what they conceived this purpose to be and how they thought it would be fulfilled.

The earliest Hebrew historian of whom we have any knowledge is the man responsible for the oldest source in the Pentateuch. He used ancient stories to depict man as created to live in close fellowship with God. By man's wilfulness and false independence he destroyed that relationship and has become alienated from God, so that life has gone very badly for him ever since. But God, this first historian taught, was not prepared to let it go at that. Rather, he was seeking some way of repairing the relationship. His method (and here our author leaves mythological parable and begins his history) was to choose a man, Abraham, and to bring into being through him a nation, Israel, which would be obedient and responsive to God, and which would indeed be in the close relationship with God that was originally intended. "I will be their God and they shall be my people"—that is the theme-song of the Old Testament.

This purpose of God in history is first expressed in the Old Testament in the form of a promise to Abraham that his descendants should become a nation and have a land of their own, but when with the settlement in Canaan and the setting up of the Davidic Kingdom the promise was in its literal sense fulfilled, the recognition that this was nevertheless not the full satisfaction of their hopes left the Hebrews free to recognize that the promise was capable of a further fulfillment in history. The culmination of God's purpose was not merely that they should be a nation living in a land of their own, but also that they should be a people, in a right, indeed perfect, relationship with their God. Only then could the old dream be said to be fully realized: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people."

The outstanding disability under which they lived was, of course, Gentile oppression. Not until that was dealt with could the purpose of God be accomplished. So they began to look forward to the "Day of the Lord." This was a day in the future when God would intervene directly in human affairs, and make His rule over all the nations fully effective. It would achieve the overthrow of all Israel's enemies, and would leave her in peace and prosperity to enjoy the providential and righteous rule of God as their Divine King. Thus we find three leading motifs beginning to emerge: first, the ending of the hostility of the Gentiles; secondly, the material prosperity and security of Israel; and thirdly, the justice and righteousness which would characterize the ideal existence of Israel in the New Age.

We can illustrate these things by referring to what is the finest of all the Golden Age prophecies:

> It shall come to pass in the latter days
> that the mountain of the house of the LORD
> shall be established as the highest of the mountains,
> and shall be raised above the hills;
> and all the nations shall flow to it.
> Many peoples shall come, and say:
> "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD,
> to the house of the God of Jacob;
> that he may teach us his ways
> and that we may walk in his paths."
> For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
> and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.
> He shall judge between the nations,
> and shall decide for many peoples;
> and they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
> and their spears into pruning hooks;
> nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
> neither shall they learn war any more.

But while these three motifs intertwine in such passages to form the red cord of hope which runs through all the prophetic literature, there is a fourth strand which we need to observe carefully. It is, as it were, a contrasting thread of black, and therefore the most easily distinguished and on that account perhaps the most well-known. We meet it first in the book of Amos:

> Woe to you who desire the day of the LORD!
> Why would you have the day of the LORD?
> It is darkness, and not light;
> as if a man fled from a lion,
> and a bear met him;
> or went into the house and leaned
> with his hand against the wall,
> and a serpent bit him.
> Is not the day of the LORD darkness, and not light,
> and gloom with no brightness in it?

Here Amos is obviously dissenting from the popular optimistic expectation. The Day of the Lord is not something to be light-heartedly hoped-for, but rather it is a day which Israel must await with fear and dread. If the wrath of the Lord is to be let loose on his Day, then clearly, says Amos, it will fall most heavily on guilty Israel, since she too, in spite of all her privileges, is alien in character and practice from God's own ideals:

> You only have I known
> of all the families of the earth;
> therefore I will punish you
> for all your iniquities . . .

This idea was taken up and restated by Isaiah, and it becomes part of the prophetic tradition. It is the little-known prophet Zechariah who produced one of the most vivid descriptions of this aspect of the Day of the Lord:

> The great day of the LORD is near,
> near and hastening fast;
> the sound of the day of the LORD is bitter,
> the mighty man cries aloud there.
> A day of wrath is that day,
> a day of distress and anguish,
> a day of ruin and devastation,
> a day of darkness and gloom,
> a day of clouds and thick darkness,
> a day of trumpet blast and battle cry
> against the fortified cities
> and against the lofty battlements.

As the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the Judean state drew nearer and its inevitable character became more and more clear, the Day of the Lord and the impending fall of Jerusalem were naturally brought into closer relationship. They were, I think, never quite identified, but certainly the historical disaster was seen in the context and portrayed under the symbolism of the eschatological disaster. No one brought this out so vividly as Jeremiah, who in some moods saw the approaching disaster as nothing less than universal in its dimensions:

> I looked on the earth, and lo, it was waste and void;
> and to the heavens, and they had no light.
> I looked on the mountains, and lo, they were quaking,
> and all the hills moved to and fro.
> I looked, and lo, there was no man,
> and all the birds of the air had fled.
> I looked, and lo, the fruitful land was a desert,
> and all its cities were laid in ruins
> before the LORD, before his fierce anger.

When the disaster actually took place, it seems to have expurgated for a while this sense of foreboding and judgment, but as the shock of the destruction of Jerusalem passed, so the note of judgment and doom crept back again into the eschatological expectation.

This is markedly so in the literature of the intertestamental period. Many of these writings are apocalypses, that is, they purport to reveal what the end of the world will be like. Most of them use involved symbolisms and strange imagery to convey their message, but this is merely the language which their age and situation forced upon them. Behind the use of what has been aptly described as the "apocalyptic menageries" stands a very sober purpose: to reiterate and carry further the eschatological expectation of the Old Testament. The main motifs are still the same: on the one hand, the overthrow of the Gentiles, the security and prosperity of Israel,

and the spiritual blessedness of the redeemed community; and on the other, the doom and judgment of God's wrath on all wickedness. But the significant thing about this literature is that in it the Golden Age which is to follow upon the end of history comes to be conceived as not taking place in this world, but in a new, transcendental existence or heaven. Probably this is due to Persian and Greek influences, but when we come to the New Testament, we find that this is also the assumption of Jesus and his followers. Indeed, we may say that the only major difference between Christian and Jewish teaching on this theme is the same difference as distinguishes all Christian thought from Jewish: Christian thought is centred in, and revolves around, the person of Jesus. Thus the Day of the Lord still has the same double character of bliss and doom, of vindication and judgment, but it has now become the Day of the Son of Man. Further, the nationalistic emphasis on the overthrow of the Gentiles and on the material prosperity of redeemed Israel, recedes into the background, and the main emphasis is on the spiritual happiness of the redeemed community reunited with Jesus. St. Mark quotes Jesus as making use of the apocalyptic imagery, but in a restrained and therefore all the more impressive manner:

> But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will be falling from heaven, and the powers in the heavens will be shaken. And then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And then he will send out the angels, and gather his elect from the four winds, from the ends of the earth to the ends of heaven.

In St. Luke we find that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans was foreseen by Jesus, and that, like the prophets of old, he sees the impending historical disaster in terms of the eschatological disaster:

> But when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near.
> And there will be signs in sun and moon and stars, and upon the earth distress of nations in perplexity at the roaring of the sea and the waves, men fainting with fear and with foreboding of what is coming on the world; for the powers of the heavens will be shaken. And then they will see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.

Once again the two are never quite identified, but the kinship between the two events is clearly recognized.

The most famous account of Christian eschatology is given us in the *Revelation of John*. Here the emphasis falls very heavily on the aspects of doom and judgment, expressed in lurid symbolism and strange imagery. It is, moreover, extremely interesting to see how the same themes, which expressed teaching about the beginning of the world, are now thrown into the future and are employed to describe the end of the world. The World-Judgment of the Flood takes a new form in the World-Judgment of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. The primeval Conflict which preceded Creation returns as Armageddon, the last conflict which precedes the Golden

Age, and the Tree of Life which was in the Garden of Eden reappears as the Tree of Life in the City of God. These age-old tales of the world's beginnings are now employed as what we might call eschatological sign-language for the indescribable realities of the World's End. The book closes, however, on a joyous note. It ends with the description, not of the coming doom, but of the ineffable joy of the Kingdom of God, the culmination of God's purpose in history and therefore the end of history:

> Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more. And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride, adorned for her husband; and I heard a great voice from the throne saying, "Behold the dwelling of God is with men. He will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them; he will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more, for the former things have passed away."

To sum up, we may say that the Christian teaching as derived from the Bible, maintains that as human history had a beginning, so it will have an end. As that beginning was God's act, so that end shall be also. "In the beginning, God . . . in the end, God." But as that end will come in judgment and destruction on all that is mean and ugly, sordid and cruel and alien to God's mind, so it will come in vindication and renewal for all that is good and true and beautiful. For those brought up in the Christian tradition, and who have learned to interpret the great disasters of history as the fearful judgment of God's moral law, the possibility of an atomic holocaust in our age is very real. It may or may not be the end of history, but it will certainly have to be viewed in that context. That is, we must say that if it comes, it will not be by blind chance, nor by man's accidental blunder, but as part of the terrible outworking of God's moral judgment. And also, we must say that if it comes, it will not be ultimate disaster. For beyond it lies the imperishable glory of the Kingdom of God. For, as St. Paul said,

> Eye hath not seen,
> Nor ear heard,
> Nor hath it entered into the heart of man—
> The things that God hath prepared for them that love Him.

That is why we Christians sing in this as in every age the great words of the *Te Deum*:

> We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge.
> We therefore pray Thee, help Thy servants,
> Whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy precious blood.
> Make them to be numbered with Thy Saints
> In glory everlasting.

The Challenge of Canadian Church History to its Historians

H. H. WALSH

SINCE Canadian Christianity is part of the missionary outreach of the European churches, its history in the main has been regarded as a codicil to European church history.[1] Such a status has hardly added to the prestige of Canadian church historiography, nor attracted many students into this field of historical research. It is a status, however, that Canadian church history shares with the history of all the younger churches both on this continent and in Asia and Africa,[2] and it is only very recently that the story of non-European Christianity has begun to be told on its own merits. One reason for the long delay has been the difficulty of adapting the history of the younger churches to the normative canons of European church history—a difficulty that has sometimes led to the conclusion that genuine church history of these younger churches cannot be written.[3] Because of this reproach, several American church historians have made a frontal attack upon the so-called normative canons of church history and are insisting that "changes must come not only in definitions, approaches and methods, but also in the attitude toward the content and subject matter of church history."[4] This is an attack in which Canadian historians may well join and strive for a church history discipline which is comprehensive enough to deal with the whole body of Christ's church throughout the world.

I

There are, however, certain basic assumptions, which distinguish church history as a discipline from other historical disciplines with which it will be difficult to dispense, even in the interest of comprehensiveness.

The first of these is the conception of the church as a people related to

1. *Vide* Philip Carrington, *A Church History for Canadians to 1900 A.D.* (Toronto, n.d.): A history for Canadians that deals mainly with the history of the Church of England. Three chapters out of forty-six are allotted to Canada and the organization of the Anglican church in Canada. There is a brief paragraph dealing with "other Protestants." In fairness to the author it must be said that the "book is written for the young people of the Church of England in Canada," nevertheless, it is a striking example of the codicil treatment of "overseas" churches.

2. An extended discussion of this subject is to be found in an article by L. J. Trinterud, "The Task of the American Church Historian," *Church History*, XXV (Mar., 1956).

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 3–4.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

God through the redeeming work of Jesus Christ.[5] As a member of the redeemed community, the church historian is called upon to record what God has wrought through the witness of the church; he must at all times help the members of the church to "look backward in time—backward on the path along which they have come,"[6] so that they may understand the true cause and hope of their status as a people of God.

A second assumption of no less importance, is that church history is universal in its outlook. In point of fact, church historians have always acted on the principle that they were engaged in a universal study; it is extremely doubtful if any historian today whether writing in Europe or America would take exception to Eusebius' dictum that "he who would commit to writing the history that contains the Church's narrative, must needs begin from the first with the beginning of the dispensation of Christ Himself . . . a dispensation more divine than most men imagine." By this after-thought Eusebius meant that "Christianity is as old as creation"' and church history actually should begin with Adam and Eve and include such worthies as Abraham, Moses and all "those friends of God in days of old."[7] Many an earlier church historian has tried to do just that, but in modern days it is customary to follow Eusebius' example and simply salute the distant ages before getting down to more recent events.

These then are the controlling assumptions of the church historian, and they do pose a problem when one is dealing with the variety and exclusiveness of sectarian Christianity of the American continent. It is possible, no doubt, to write about the churches apart from these two assumptions; a great deal of study has been given to the sects in Canada, with particular emphasis upon their cultural influence in Canadian life,[8] but such research belongs to the field of sociology rather than church history. Because of the fissiparous nature of both American and Canadian Christianity, even church historians have been tempted to write Christian sociology rather than church history; but if the church historian abandons his controlling assumptions and becomes a mere chronicler of religion he is depriving himself of the unique interpretative insight which distinguishes him from the secular historian. As it has been said of the historian generally: only he "who is excited by his participation in history . . . will be able to understand history,"[9] so it can be said specifically of the church historian: only he who is excited by his participation in the church is able to understand church history.

5. Such a definition of the church in relation to history is to be found in Karl Barth, *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day* (London, 1939) pp. 5 *et seq.*

6. Quoted from Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

7. Eusebius, *TheEcclesiastical History, etc.* (trans. by Lawlor & Oulton, London, 1927, 2 vols.), vol. 1, pp. 4 and 14.

8. S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto, 1948); C. A. Dawson, *Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada* (Toronto, 1936) and W. E. Mann, *Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta* (Toronto, 1955) are the most important studies in this field.

9. R. Bultmann, *History and Eschatology* (Edinburgh, 1957), p. 122.

It may be contended that such participation detracts from the objectivity of the historian, but his involvement in the church need imply no more bias than is common to all historians who must necessarily belong to a human culture and are dependent upon some common orientation towards experience if they are to communicate with their readers. And once it is conceded that all history must necessarily be subjective—Professor Bultmann goes so far as to say that " . . . the most subjective interpretation of history is at the same time the most objective"[10] then the church historian is on an equality with his secular colleagues who also have their controlling assumptions; and along with these assumptions, which may well include "the central events of the faith,"[11] he can also make use of all the techniques and tools of secular history; he can be just as "critical and discriminating in his judgments" and just as conscientious in this "choice and sorting"[12] as the most scientific historian. Nor will he, since Collingwood, indulge in mere "scissors and paste" history or depend "altogether upon the testimony of authorities;"[13] nor will he forget Collingwood's warning that if the events of the past are to live in the present "they should vibrate in the historian's mind."[14] But in order that the Canadian historian may do this very thing and take cognizance of all the many vital aspects of Canadian Christianity, it is necessary that he free himself from much of the methodology and presuppositions of European church historians.

II

At least two of these presuppositions must be summarily dismissed as of no value in the New World. The first is what has been described as the "patching on" view of the continuity of church history; the second is a concentration on national church history to the depreciation of dissenting or so-called heretical churches. The "patching on" view no doubt arose out of the concept of the church universal in which the historian would take "a comprehensive backward look to the Garden of Eden,"[15] a view that was further strengthened by the historiography of the post-Renaissance period when classical interests began to dominate Western thinking. Under this influence all true history was regarded as beginning with Greece and Rome and national histories were conceived as something to be added on to the history of the Greco-Roman world. Church historians under the same influence thought of church history in terms of the church fathers who were either Greek or Roman; consequently the history of the various national churches of Europe appeared as sequels to the regular church histories of the

10. *Ibid.*
11. J. McIntyre, *The Christian Doctrine of History* (Edinburgh & London, 1957), p. 3.
12. Quoted from *Jacques Maritain on the Philosophy of History*, ed. by J. W. Evans (New York, 1957), p. 3.
13. *Vide* R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford, 1946), p. 257.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 202.
15. Quoted from L. G. Trinterud, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

fathers.[16] Although this "patched on" type of history does retain the continuity of the church from apostolic days to the present time, it hardly does justice to the autonomous development of European churches, particularly to the history of dissent; and it becomes almost unmanageable when applied to the American continent, where "patching on" becomes twice removed from the original church.

This disservice is even exceeded when Europeans, preoccupied with a national or established church, regard it as the true church and retain, as it were, only a Catholic covering for the separated churches under the titles of dissent or non-conformity. Such terms with their derogatory implication will not do in the New World where very frequently an Old World dissenting religion may well have become the dominant cultural influence in large areas of the American continent.

III

While New World church historians continued to adhere to the Old World canons it remained almost impossible to write a comprehensive history of either American or Canadian religious development. The first church historian to challenge the European concept and pioneer in new methods and techniques was Professor W. W. Sweet, who is now generally recognized as the dean of American church historians. With the appearance of his *The Story of Religion in America* in 1930, a new era in the field of church history began, but even as late as 1950 Professor Sweet complains that "Religion has been the most neglected phase of American history," and he underlines his complaint by saying, "The average college student could pass a better examination in Greek mythology than in American church history and is better informed on the Medieval popes than he is on the religious leaders of America."[17]

In seeking a new method of making American church history more than a mere "appendage to general church history on the one hand or denominational monographs on the other"[18] Professor Sweet, perhaps, relied too much on the discipline of secular American history;[19] nevertheless, he did infuse a new spirit into the study of American Christianity and has succeeded, as he intended, in reminding "secular historians of the religious factors that have helped to shape America" as well "as impressing denominational and other historians of religion of the significance of other religious groups and the secular forces in shaping their particular groups."[20]

Since Professor Sweet's pioneer effort there has been a growing accumulation of publications on American church history (Professor Sweet himself

16. This theory is more fully discussed by Trinterud, *op. cit., passim.*
17. W. W. Sweet, *Religion in Colonial America* (New York, 1951), p. vii.
18. Quoted from an article by S. E. Mead, "Professor Sweet's Religion and Culture in America," *Church History,* XXII (Mar., 1953), p. 45.
19. *Ibid.,* p. 53.
20. Quoted by Mead *op. cit.,* p. 33, from "Every Dog Has His Day," *The University of Chicago Magazine,* XXXIX (Feb., 1947), p. 11.

is godfather to more than thirty Ph.D. theses on some aspect or other of American church history), and an intense discussion by students of the subject on the best interpretative approach to what is still an almost untilled field of research. In all this discussion an interpretative method is being sought which will avoid the temptation of becoming mere Christian sociology, but will at the same time provide themes sufficiently comprehensive to do justice to the complex history of Christianity on the American continents.[21] A careful study of this literature [22] can materially help to smooth the path of the Canadian church historian as he tries to wend his way through as complex a religious development as that of the United States.

IV

One conclusion that has become quite generally accepted by American historians is that the term *Catholic* can no longer be identified, as it often is by European historians, with an institutional expression of Christianity. As Professor L. J. Trinterud has rightly observed, ". . . seldom do these institutional expressions allow of easy harmonization;" consequently, "Church history becomes largely the history of the warfare within and between these various ecclesiastical institutions which we know as 'churches'."[23] Because of this lack of harmony in defining the church and also because all ecclesiastical institutions have had an historical development it is now pretty well agreed among American church historians that they have no firm standard whereby they can exclude any church or sect from the history of the church universal. Therefore, it follows that the concept of the Catholic church must be broad enough and inclusive enough to embody all those who at any time past and present have claimed or do claim redemption through Jesus Christ. It must be admitted that this larger concept of the Catholic church imposes a particularly onerous burden upon both American and Canadian church historians because of the fissiparous nature of the material they have to deal with; nevertheless, the church historian must consider sympathetically and with understanding all religious groups, however fanatical or bizarre, if he is to do complete justice to church development on this continent.

This does not mean that he abandons his critical faculties or that he does not have his own perception of the Gospel; in point of fact he does permit himself the same freedom of judgment in treating the claims of a sect as he permits himself in judging his own particular branch of the church Catholic; but he must always remain aware that he himself, unless he claims infallibility, cannot be the final judge in these high matters of spiritual discernment.

21. *Vide* E. H. Harbinson, "The 'Meaning of History' and the Writing of History," *Church History*, XXI (June, 1952); an interesting discussion of the Christian understanding of history and the influence of modern secular historians on this understanding.

22. *Vide* R. T. Handy, "Survey of Recent Literature: American Church History," *Church History*, XXVII (June, 1958), pp. 161–167; an exhaustive survey of the more recent literature.

23. L. J. Trinterud *op. cit.*, p. 10.

V

In thus providing sectarianism with a more respectable status than has been customary in European church histories, it becomes necessary to look more closely at its theological origins and its European development. Such an investigation soon reveals the inadequacy of the older church histories in which the sects are very often portrayed from a negative point of view, as threatening the norms and structures of the national church, or as culturally divisive forces. Because of this older approach to a religious phenomenon that has in America created the typically free and popular churches of the frontier, it becomes almost a necessity to rewrite the religious background of New World Christianity. This to some extent has been done by Professor J. H. Nichols who in the opening pages of his *History of Christianity 1650–1950*, states quite frankly that he is going to treat the many separated church traditions "as if they were all part of the Christian society, the church, or as if the church were to be found in significant measure with them."[24]

Such a treatment brings into prominence many themes that are only lightly touched upon by older church historians. One is revivalism which opens up a whole series of allied issues, the most significant being voluntaryism, namely, that religious institutions should depend upon the free-will contributions of the membership. To the European historian the American interest in these themes may seem excessive since revivalism has perhaps played only a minor rôle in European cultural development; but the interest is by no means excessive when it is realized that revivalism and many of the principles it fostered, such as voluntaryism, lay-participation in religion, and democracy itself, have brought about a revolution in church organizations on this continent. As a matter of fact, the theme of organization always occupies a prominent place in both American and Canadian church histories. How this has come about has been very succinctly explained by Professor Sydney E. Mead in an illuminating article in *Church History*, in which he points out that during the upheavals of the Great Awakenings the patterns of sectarian religion began to infiltrate the conventional churches and thus "through confusion and compromise" there began an "historical merging of the traditional patterns of 'church' and 'sect', 'right' and 'left' wings, as known in Europe, into a new kind of organization combining features of both plus features growing out of the immediate situation."[25] To this resulting organizational form Mead has applied the term "denominationalism" which he considers a peculiarly American phenomenon and "unlike anything that had preceded it in Christendom."[26] Such being the case there is good and sufficient reason for American church historians to make a fresh review of the European religious scene, so that they may be-

24. J. H. Nichols, *History of Christianity 1650–1950* (New York, 1956), p. iii.
25. S. E. Mead, "From Coercion to Persuasion," *Church History*, XXV (Dec., 1956), p. 22.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 21–22.

come better acquainted with the origins of a very self-conscious religious ideal which is frequently reiterated in the oft-repeated slogan, "Go to the church of your choice."

VI

Since denominationalism is also a Canadian phenomenon, this contemplated revision of European church history may well help the Canadian church historian to set forth Canadian church development more clearly and significantly. And yet he must use this material with caution, for there are variations in the Canadian and American developments which prevent as radical a break with European concepts and methods for the Canadian historian as for the American. For one thing, church history in Canada begins with New France in which the union of church and state continued for almost a century and a half and was so firmly established that the alliance has partially prevailed in French Canada down to the present day. Under these circumstances it seems quite possible to keep the first half of Canadian church history firmly within the concepts of European historiography; except for the fact that the French Canadian church did not remain immune to the democratic spirit of the frontier. Outstanding evidence of this is the prominence of lay participation in the councils of the church, which in the words of Archbishop Roy of Quebec has led to the formation "of a type of religious grouping to be found nowhere else perhaps but in French Canada."[27]

To this may be added an additional factor, namely, that the Roman Catholic Church in Canada joined with dissenting groups to oppose the British government's attempt to establish the Church of England in Canada. Thus, unwittingly perhaps, the Roman Catholic Church in Canada made its contribution to the ideal of denominationalism, and can in some sense fit into the canons of American church historiography. On the other hand, its strongly rooted seventeenth century concepts, its semi-established position in the province of Quebec and its consistent emphasis upon loyalty to the ruling authorities both in church and state, has made its impact upon the Protestant churches in Canada and gives the latter a religious outlook that is not always in accord with Protestant development in the United States. Thus there has been in Canada a religious mood that questions the ultimate desirability of denominationalism and does hanker for greater uniformity of religious expression in the interest of cultural unity. The long series of church unions in Canada, culminating in the United Church of Canada, is the historical expression of an ideal that looks beyond American denominationalism as the final "destiny which awaits the whole of the Church Catholic in the future."[28]

27. M. Roy, *The Parish and Democracy in French Canada* (Toronto, 1950), p. 15.
28. *Vide*, L. J. Trinterud, *op. cit.*, p. 9. The larger content from which the quotation is taken sees a different future for the Church Catholic: "Whatever 'the fissiporous American religiosity' may in fact be, it seems indeed to be that destiny which awaits the whole of the Church Catholic in the future."

VII

It seems, then, that the Canadian church historian is challenged to combine the techniques of both the European and American church historians; but his supreme challenge, as it is of any church historian, is to communicate and make relevant to his readers the part that the Canadian church has contributed to the redemption history of Jesus Christ. That does not mean, however, that he overlooks the importance of Canadian church history in understanding the national development of Canada. For it is evident that many of our secular historians miss not a few of the static factors of our cultural development, to say nothing of the poetry and intangibles which are inseparably bound up with our religious expression. But these are the subordinate responsibilities of the church historian; though without discharging them he would not be doing full justice to his larger task of making the history of the Canadian church relevant to the history of the Catholic church of God. In other words, the historian of the church of Canada has an overriding responsibility of contributing to the writing of a truly universal history of the church.

It is in meeting these two demands, the national and the supra-national, that the problem of communication becomes most acute; for his larger audience he must be more or less informative as he sets forth the claim to universal significance of the great variety and novelty of church life in Canada; for his smaller audience he must, in a subdued sense, be hortatory as he sets forth its involvement in the larger life of the church universal.

Above all, the church historian, within whatever geographical area he writes, must be sensitively aware of what has been described by Karl Jaspers as an "axial period," lying somewhere between 800 and 200 B.C., when man became "conscious of Being as a whole of himself and his limitations."[29] It is also with a fairly comprehensive knowledge of the meaningful occurrences of the past—the breathless history of the last six thousand years, with its significant landmarks of revelation—that the Canadian church historian tries to throw some light upon the church history of his own little cranny of here and now.

29. On the "Axial Period" *vide* K. Jaspers, *The Origin and Goal of History* (London, 1953), p. 2.

"An axis of world history, if such a thing exists, would have to be discovered *empirically*, as a fact capable of being accepted as such by all men, Christians included. . . . It would seem that this axis of history is to be found in the period around 500 B.C., in the spiritual process that occurred between 800 and 200 B.C. It is there that we meet with the most deepcut dividing line in history. Man, as we know him today, came into being. For short we may style this the 'Axial Period' " (p. 1).

Perfectionism in Psychology and in Theology

W. S. TAYLOR

IN psychology, perfectionism is a sign of personality disorder, while in theology it refers to a doctrine with a long and reputable history. This confusion of meaning creates problems for the Christian which are both theoretic and practical. It seems worth while, therefore, to sort out some of the reasons for the confusion, and to try to get a clearer understanding of what the search for perfection involves.

I. Perfectionism in Psychology

Perfectionism is considered to be a sign of personality disorder in much contemporary psychological thought. "The need for perfection," says Karen Horney, "is the most radical" of the misleading forms of self-idealization from which the neurotic suffers. "Self-idealization always entails a general self-glorification," and this "is what I suggest calling a *comprehensive neurotic solution*."[1]

The emphasis on self-idealization in modern psychology reflects its concern with what C. R. Rogers calls "the compelling necessity which the individual feels to search for and become himself."[2] In the process of doing this, the individual forms an ideal picture of himself (using the word ideal in its psychological rather than in its ethical sense), and strives to live it out in the concrete circumstances of his life. "The history of ten years' research on this . . . problem," wrote G. W. Allport, with reference to the development of modern ego-psychology, "is too intricate to trace here, but unless I am mistaken every investigation has directly or indirectly confirmed Hoppe's initial claim that the subject behaves in such a manner as to maintain his self-esteem at the highest possible level."[3] Initially one's self-ideal develops by a process of identification with members of one's immediate family circle. Contemporary psychology lays a good deal of emphasis on this process of identification, which is, as O. H. Mowrer points out,[4] one of the significant ways in which it is transcending the earlier Freudian picture. Having begun to develop its self-image through identification, the child continues to develop largely under the influence of the drive to actualize

1. K. Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth* (W. W. Norton & Co., 1950), pp. 22–24 (Italics in original).
2. C. R. Rogers, "What it means to become a Person," in Moustakas and Jayaswal (eds.), *The Self* (Harper & Bros., 1956), p. 199.
3. G. W. Allport, "The Ego in Contemporary Psychology," in *The Psychological Review*, Vol. 50, 1943, p. 470.
4. O. H. Mowrer, *Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics* (Arnold Press, 1950), Chapter 21.

this image: " . . . we have to *assume only one drive*," says K. Goldstein, "*the drive for self-actualization.*"[5]

The first phrase of Goldstein's statement is significant. While it has been customary to emphasize a number of specific drives, with the growth of the self as a product of these drives, there is a considerable movement today to treat the realization of the self-image as the dominant factor, with the urge to satisfy specific drives as an abnormal deviation. "The traditional view," writes Goldstein, "assumes various drives . . . We assume only one drive, the drive for self-actualization of the organism;"[6] and again "this tendency to actualize its nature, to *actualize 'itself' is the basic drive, the only drive by which the life of the organism is determined.*"[7] Action governed by specific drives is evidence of a defective organism; it is "an abnormal deviation from normal behaviour."[8] This "wholesome turn in theorizing,"[9] as G. W. Allport characterized the new emphasis on the importance of the self, reflects at times an almost Biblical concern to treat each human response as a response of the whole person, which cannot be broken down into any aggregate of specific drives or functions. "The effect pattern," says Goldstein again, "depends primarily on the functional *significance of the stimulus for the whole organism.*"[10] Behaviour is to be interpreted by reference to "the activities of the organism as a whole."[11]

In the light of this emphasis one can see why methods of actualizing the self-image are assuming such importance in current psychological interpretations of personality, and why the deviations indicated by the term "perfectionism" are considered so dangerous. These dangers appear in three forms which are of particular importance for us.

The first characteristic of the perfectionist is that he has lost his grip on reality. He is unable to see as clearly as he should the relation between his ideal self-image and the actual conditions in which he must live, between what he feels he should be and what he actually is. He "is bound to look at his actual self . . . from a wrong perspective. The glorified self becomes not only a phantom to be pursued, it also becomes a measuring rod with which to measure his actual being."[12] He "identifies himself with his standards."[13] Feeling under a compulsion to live out this ideal character under the actual conditions of daily life, he expects others to treat him correspondingly. Escape from the resulting conflicts and tensions is possible only by giving up his idealized self-image, or by denying the realities of his immediate situation. But the perfectionist can do neither. It would be

5. K. Goldstein, *The Organism* (American Book Co., 1939), p. 197 (Italics in original).
6. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 196 (Italics in original).
8. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
9. G. W. Allport, "The Trend in Motivational Theory," in C. E. Moustakas and S. R. Jayaswal (eds.), *The Self* (Harper & Bros., 1956), p. 41.
10 K. Goldstein, *op. cit.*, p. 218 (Italics in original).
11. *Ibid*, p. 204.
12. K. Horney, *op. cit.*, p. 110.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 196.

tantamount to acknowledging failure, which the perfectionist cannot do without surrendering his whole system of self-respect. He is consequently driven increasingly to deny the relevance, and then the reality, of the concrete details of daily life, building up a system of conceptual defences against them. He may appeal to his idealized self-image to buttress this system of defences. His self-image and his defences against reality interact on each other in a circular process by which they are mutually strengthened. "The central issue in the patient's endeavours to ward off an experience . . . of self-contempt is to avoid any realization of unfulfilled shoulds . . . he must therefore fight off any real insight into these shortcomings . . . any suggestion of these shortcomings . . . puts him on the defensive . . . it prevents him from a sober examination of the truth."[14]

Similar conclusions are reached from studies of people recovering from personality disorder, and of people considered normal. In the process of counseling therapy, says C. R. Rogers, the "individual becomes more open to his experience . . . It is the opposite of defensiveness."[15] Speaking of one patient he says she "has come to accept a more realistic view of her abilities and of her ultimate attainments";[16] and again, she "has changed from a person who feels she must be perfect . . . to a person who can have comfortable goals of achievement."[17] The therapy makes one "far more realistic in dealing with new people, new situations, new problems . . . This openness of awareness to what exists *at this moment* in *this situation* is, I believe, an important element in the description of the person who emerges from therapy."[18] "He has a relatively accurate perception of the existential situation in all its complexity."[19]

A. H. Maslow, studying a carefully selected group of people considered to be unusually healthy, came to similar conclusions. He reported that his subjects were selected on two grounds. Negatively they must show "an absence of neurosis, psychopathic personality, psychosis or strong tendencies in those directions"[20] as evidenced by tests stringent enough to cause the rejection of all but 1 out of 3000 university students examined. Positively they must show evidence of considerable achievement in interpersonal relations, and ability to actualize their ideals without observable neurotic by-products. He called them self-actualizing people, and placed them at the opposite pole from perfectionists. " . . . the self-actualized person," he notes, "sees reality more clearly." He is "able to see concealed or confused realities more swiftly and more correctly than others"; " . . . self-actualizing people distinguish far more easily than most the fresh, concrete and idio-

14. *Ibid.*, p. 335.
15. C. R. Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 203.
16. C. R. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Houghton Mifflin, 1942), p. 192.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 194.
18. C. R. Rogers "What it means to become a Person," in Moustakas and Jayaswal, (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 204 (Italics in original).
19. *Ibid.*, p. 206.
20. A. H. Maslow, "Self-Actualizing People," in Moustakas and Jayaswal (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 161.

syncratic from the generic, abstract and 'rubricized'. The consequence is that they live more in the real world of nature than in the man-made set of concepts, expectations, beliefs and stereotypes which most people confuse with the world."[21] He sums up the evidence from several contributing sources by saying that the neurotic "does not perceive the real world as accurately or as effectively as does a healthy person."[22]

The second characteristic of the perfectionist can be stated more briefly since it is implied in what has already been said. He lacks an adequate grasp of the relationship between means and ends. In his effort to live out his idealized pictures, he shows a striking "*disregard for feasibility* which pervades his entire drive for actualization," a "complete *disregard for the conditions* under which they could be fulfilled."[23] He tends to telescope the whole process involved in realizing his objective, treating the end-result as though it were the next step, and dropping out the intermediate links. Perfectionists emphasize "Immediate and absolute perfection. They aim . . . at making it appear *as if* the particular perfection were attained." If they think they *should* be like their ideal, then "in their minds they *have* all these qualities."[24]

By contrast, people who are able to actualize their ideals in a normal and healthy way "behave as though, for them, means and ends are clearly distinguishable. In general, they are fixed on ends rather than on means, and means are quite definitely subordinated to these ends."[25]

The third characteristic of perfectionism is its "coercive character,"[26] its compulsiveness, rooted in the intense feelings accompanying the perfectionist's effort to practise his idealized pattern of behaviour. Any suggestion that this pattern of behaviour may not be immediately practicable sets off "violent emotional reactions to non-fulfilment—reactions which traverse the whole range of anxiety, despair, self-condemnation and self-destructive impulses. To the outsider they appear entirely out of proportion to the provocation. But they are entirely in proportion to what it means to the individual."[27] The perfectionist cannot bear to admit the disparity between his ideal and his present pattern of behaviour. To remove a mask which one had thought was a part of one's real self can be, as Rogers says,[28] a deeply disturbing experience for even a fairly stable personality, much more so for the perfectionist. "Just as a misfortune pulls the ground away from under him, so does a realization of his own fallibility."[29] Conversely he is under such intense pressure to insist on the immediate practicability of his ideal that his behaviour, in relation to this ideal, becomes compulsive.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 169, 165, 166.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 166.
23. K. Horney, *op. cit.*, p. 66 (Italics in original).
24. *Ibid.*, p. 66 (Italics in original).
25. A. H. Maslow, *op. cit.*, p. 184.
26. K. Horney, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
28. C. R. Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 198.
29. K. Horney, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

The distinction between unhealthy perfectionism and healthy idealism is recognized by the psychologist as being important. It hinges largely on the method by which the attempt is made to realize the ideal. There is "a profoundly different psychology of motivation," [30] says Maslow, for people capable of actualizing the ideal in healthy ways. He calls it a growth motivation as opposed to a deficiency motivation, that is, a motivation capable of recognizing the significance of time differences between present and future, and of exercising rational foresight and responsible judgment regarding means and ends. Where the perfectionist tends to be compulsive, for the normal person "the wish, the judgment, the decision is ours . . . efforts of this kind give us freedom and strength."[31]

II. Perfectionism in Theology

In theology perfectionism refers not to a disorder but to a doctrine which R. N. Flew goes so far as to describe as "veritably the King's highway."[32] It goes back for its foundation to the words attributed to Christ: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Mat. 5:48). It appeals for support to numerous statements in the New Testament epistles,[33] some of which require future perfection (2 Cor. 13: 11), some of which assume perfection already attained (Phil. 3:15), and some of which refer perfection to its source (Heb. 10:14).

Five features of the Christian doctrine of perfection provide significant points of comparison with modern psychological thought.

In the first place, Christian teaching on perfection has recognized the importance of a time factor. In one sense, perfection belongs to the future life, when we shall see God "face to face" (1 Cor. 13:12). That which is "incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away" is "reserved in heaven for you" (1 Pet. 1:4). Yet, in another sense, Christian perfection can be realized in this life. Christ "hath perfected" already those who "therefore" have "boldness to enter into the holiest . . . by a new and living way" (Heb. 10:14, 19, 20). While there is continuity between the two kinds of perfection, they are by no means identical. The distinction between what may be called ultimate perfection and immediate perfection runs through the story of Christian thought, and, though more emphasis is sometimes laid on one aspect and sometimes on the other, though the nature of the relation between them is variously interpreted, the double emphasis is never wholly lost. The Christian, even when he claims immediate perfection, acknowledges the lack of ultimate perfection. In one sense, a part of his immediate perfection consists in acknowledging that there is another perfection which is beyond his capacity to realize in the circumstances of his immediate life.

A second, associated, characteristic of perfection as it is understood in Christian theology, is a deep sense of humility. In the parable of the Phari-

30. A. H. Maslow, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
31. K. Horney, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
32. R. N. Flew, *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (Oxford, 1934), p. xii.
33. E.g. Phil. 2:5; 2 Cor. 13:9; Col. 1:28.

see and the Publican, Christ pointed out the significance of this feature. "When we speak of the perfection of the saints," wrote John Calvin, quoting Augustine with approval, "part of this perfection consists in the recognition of our imperfection, both in truth and in humility."[34] John Wesley, even when urging that "all our preachers should make a point of preaching perfection to believers constantly, strongly and explicitly,"[35] recognized the immense danger of spiritual self-satisfaction: " . . . the most perfect," he wrote, "have continual need of the merits of Christ."[36] In an enquiry about perfection, when he was asked, "What is the first advice that you would give?" he answered, "watch and pray continually against pride."[37] "In our perfection," wrote P. T. Forsyth, "there is a permanent element of repentence."[38]

A much more fundamental reason for the emphasis on humility is the Christian conviction that perfection is never a personal achievement. It is basically a gift. When St. Paul speaks of the need for constant effort in pressing on towards the mark, and urges that "as many as be perfect" should be "thus minded," he lays the foundation for his argument by saying that what he strives to apprehend is only that for which he has already been apprehend by Christ (Phil. 3:12–15). There is, he says, no ground for boasting (Eph. 2:7, 8). This does not preclude an emphasis on good works, which are the fruits of the Spirit. But even where Christian teaching has seemed to emphasize works to the detriment of faith, to insist that faith without works is bad, and that "by works a man is justified, and not by faith only," (James 2:17, 24) it has first insisted that "every good gift and every perfect gift is from above," (James 1:17) so that the ground of pride in personal achievement is undercut. Even in the mediaeval period, which laid more emphasis on works of merit than either New Testament or Reformation theology would ordinarily countenance, "grace was as much the very ground and environment of mediaeval religion as was merit."[39] Protestant teaching on perfection has been explicit on this point: " . . . perfection such as enables a person to fulfil the whole law, and so needs not the merits of Christ—I acknowledge no such perfection; I do now and always did protest against it,"[40] said John Wesley. "Christian perfection," he says, "is received merely by faith."[41] And when asked about the place of works in perfection: "But what does the perfect one do more than others?" he replied, "Perhaps nothing."[42]

What has already been said bears directly on the third characteristic of Christian thinking about perfection—its inseparable connection with the life,

34. J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book III, Chapter 17, translated by W. J. Allen, Presbyterian Board of Publications and Sabbath School Work, 1902, Vol. II, p. 50.
35. J. Wesley, *Works*, ed. J. Emory (Lane & Scott, 1850), Vol. VI, p. 529.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 501.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 520.
38. P. T. Forsyth, quoted in R. N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 410.
39. J. S. Whale, *The Protestant Tradition* (Cambridge, 1955), p. 48.
40. J. Wesley, quoted in R. N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 325.
41. J. Wesley, *Works, op. cit.*, p. 500.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 504.

death and resurrection of Christ. Enough has been said to indicate how specifically the New Testament writers emphasize this connection. Theologians through the ages have remained true to this emphasis, however variously they have developed its implications. It will be useful, however, to notice three subordinate forms in which this conviction has expressd itself.

In the first place, Christ provides the norm of Christian perfection. The Christian aiming at perfection looks to a historic person rather than to a conceptually defined standard, or to a subjective image. This emphasis is fundamental to the New Testament outlook, and has never been wholly forsaken in later Christian thought.

In the second place Christ gives the assurance that, by God's grace, a measure of perfection is possible. Though setting standards of perfection more difficult of achievement than any which a man is likely to set for himself, and which are likely in the normal way to produce frustration, despair, and other forms of personality disorder in anyone seriously concerned to practice them, he also provides increased resources to achieve these standards. Theologians may differ endlessly over the method by which these resources are provided, but not over the fact.

Thirdly, in providing these new resources, Christ establishes a new order in which the Christian is a "new man."[43] The new order is both objective and subjective. It involves a new relationship between man and God and between man and man. It also involves a new organization of motives and of values in the thinking of the individual. The establishment of this new order gives the Christian concept of perfection its meaning and makes it possible.

In view of these three emphases it is important to note more precisely the meaning which Christian perfection has in the context of this new order; and this leads us to the fourth feature of the Christian idea of perfection.

Christian perfection is more a religious than an ethical perfection. Though this distinction raises problems, one cannot avoid drawing it in the light of Christian thinking on this question. For theologians it comes up in connection with the concept of sinlessness. "Perfection is not sinlessness," says P. T. Forsyth. "The perfect in the New Testament are certainly not the sinless." [44] Ritschl agrees: "The conception of moral perfection in the Christian life ought on no account to be associated with the idea of a fruitless search for actual sinlessness of conduct."[45] "I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes those involuntary transgressions," wrote John Wesley. "Therefore *sinless perfection* is a phrase I never use."[46] "For nothing proceeds from the most perfect man," says Calvin, "which is wholly immaculate."[47] St. Paul recognizes that even those who are perfect are capable of backsliding and sin.[48]

43. E.g. 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Ephes. 4:24.
44. P. T. Forsyth, *Christian Perfection*, quoted in R. N. Flew, op. cit., p. 394.
45. A. Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Eng. translation by H. R. Mackintosh & A. B. Macaulay (T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 665.
46. J. Wesley, *Works, op. cit.*, p. 501 (Italics in original).
47. J. Calvin, *Institutes*, Book III, Chapter 15, *op. cit.* Vol. II, p. 23.
48. R. N. Flew, *op. cit.*, pp. 53–60.

On this matter, however, Christian writers sometimes seem to contradict themselves and one another. In spite of the New Testament recognition that the perfect are capable of backsliding, the First Epistle of John explicitly says that "whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not," and "whoever is born of God doth not commit sin" (1 John 3:6, 9). John Wesley himself, in spite of sayings like that quoted above, also said, "A Christian is so far perfect as not to commit sin."[49] The apparent contradiction in Wesley's statements may be understood in terms of his distinction between voluntary and involuntary sins, and the difficulty of conceiving a perfection that does not involve sinlessness may be lessened if we keep in mind various senses in which the term sin can be used. St. Paul sometimes speaks of sin in the context of the old order of law and works, when it involves failure to observe requirements for specific forms of behaviour. But when he speaks of sin in the context of the new order of grace and faith, it seems to have a different meaning. It is failure to live by faith, "for whatsoever is not of faith," he says specifically, "is sin" (Rom. 14:23).

It is the great virtue of Luther, says Ritschl, that he recovers the distinction "between the irreligious and the immoral aspects of sin, and subordinates the latter to the former."[50] The former, the irreligious aspect, is the concern of Christian perfection. Though related, the two belong to different dimensions. It is this difference which gives the concept, he says, "not a quantitative but a qualitative significance." "Now there is no contradiction between the qualitative sense of Christian perfection and the fact that we still continue to be conscious of quantitative imperfectness and defectiveness even of those functions in which our Christian faith is expressed."[51] Christian perfection finds its meaning in a religious dimension: " . . . the principal thing in Christian perfection is reverence and trust in God."[52] "Whom then do you mean by one that is perfect?" asks John Wesley, and answers himself, "We mean one in whom is 'the mind that was in Christ'." "Pure love reigning alone in the heart and life—this is the whole of Scriptural perfection."[53]

Whatever one may think of these distinctions in the meaning of the term sinlessness, it seems quite clear that Christian perfection is conceived in terms of religious attitude rather than in terms of ethical observance. It is a life dominated by faith in and love to God, rather than by a struggle to act in strict conformity to ideal maxims. It is basically a personal response rather than a personal achievement. The perfect man is one who has moved into a new dimension of living, whose system of motives has been transformed by his inclusion within the new order of grace and faith. The effect is to remove the obsessional compulsiveness which so often characterizes the striving for what Ritschl would call quantitative conformity, without lessen-

49. Quoted in R. N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 325.
50. A. Ritschl, *op. cit.*, p. 171.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 651.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 333.
53. J. Wesley, *Works*, *op. cit.*, pp. 494, 505.

ing the strength of the inner desire for the ideal, thus giving something corresponding to St. Paul's thought of "the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8:21).

Finally one must note how the Christian concept of perfection requires one to recognize the difficult and unpleasant features of the concrete situation in which one must live. References to perfection in the New Testament epistles are constantly accompanied by a recognition of the weakness of human nature and the evils current in contemporary society. Far more fundamental, however, is the intimate connection in Christian thought between the idea of perfection and the Cross of Christ, with all its shame and ignominy, and with its sharp illumination of human vice. It was because Christ "humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross" that "God hath highly exalted him" (Phil. 2:8, 9). It was "this mind" (Phil. 2:5) that the Christian was to have in him—the mind capable of accomplishing its purpose in the full face of human evil, without any evasion or pretense. "I am determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2), said Paul. And it was because the Christian was "crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2:20), because he participated to some degree in Christ's victorious involvement with the worst the world could produce, that he was capable of what the Christian called perfection.

In later Protestant theology, this emphasis on victorious involvement in the concrete situations of life was expressed in a belief about the sanctity of Christian vocations in ordinary life: " . . . the Reformers hold", wrote Ritschl, "in opposition to the pretended perfection of monasticism, that faith in providence, humility, and patience and faithful activity in any calling, represent Christian perfection . . . as an injunction incumbent on all Christians."[54] "Better and more perfect is the obedience of son, wife, servant, captive than the obedience of a monk," wrote Luther, "if we are to go on from imperfection to perfection."[55] And R. N. Flew, speaking of the teaching of the Methodists on perfection, says that "the sanctification expected has been an ideal possible of attainment in the struggle and suffering of ordinary life."[56]

III. The Problem of Christian Perfection

It is obvious that the terms of perfection and perfectionism have had quite different meanings for the psychologist and for the theologian.

It must also be obvious, however, that the psychologist and the theologian agree, at a deeper level of interpretation, on some of the most significant characteristics of the healthy person in his effort to realize his ideals. The healthy person must recognize the significance of the time span involved in

54. A. Ritschl, *op. cit.*, p. 648.
55. M. Luther, *Werke* (Weimar Ed.), viii, 584, *De votis monastics.* Quoted in R. N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 245.
56. R. N. Flew, *op. cit.*, p. 330.

any effort to realize his ideal. He must have a realistic understanding of the relation between means and ends. He must have a clear and humble recognition of his own limitations. He must have a clear grasp of the difficult, and often unpleasant, features of his immediate situation as they affect the practice of his ideal. His effort to realize his ideal must be free from compulsive and obsessional features, and must be carried on by a process of responsible judgments exercised in a climate of liberty. The psychologist and the theologian agree that there is a significant difference in the structure and organization of motives between the healthy and the unhealthy person in his striving for perfection.

So far there is a measure of agreement behind differences in terminology and expression. At this point they tend to diverge, the psychologist still being concerned largely to preserve the structure and organization of motives from abnormal strain, the theologian being more concerned with the creation of a structure of motives able to withstand abnormal strain.

It is beyond the purpose of this paper to discuss how such insights as these can be applied to the practical problems faced by the Christian who is burdened with a sense of obligation to work for the realization of Christian ideals in a sub-Christian society. That they are relevant will not be seriously questioned. Christians are compelled to try to actualize their ideals in concrete situations where they are constantly "so cornered that *every* alternative open to them threatens their moral security."[57] They are convinced of the relevance of their ideal to daily life, even while they recognize the impossibility of realizing it fully in the immediate situation. They are concerned "to live the life of angels" even while fully acknowledging "the corruptions of the world" in which it must be lived—than which, as Calvin said, "nothing is more difficult."[58] In circumstances like these, the insights of the psychologist and the theologian have distinct relevance to the problem of the individual Christian.

For our present purpose it is enough to point out how clearly these insights serve to indicate the points of danger in Christian practice. The Christian who is concerned about perfection, as the theologian understands it, can slip over with disturbing ease into the practice of perfectionism as the psychologist has described it. It is helpful to know some of the signs of deterioration, for the Christian is constantly under double pressure, both from the culture of which he is a part, and from the ideal of perfection to which he cannot be disloyal. Under such pressures, a search for perfection which is spiritually edifying can readily turn into a practice of perfectionism which is spiritually stultifying. Calvin, as so often happens, has a wise word to say on the matter: "I admit that we are not to labour feebly or coldly in urging perfection, far less desist from urging it; but I hold that it is a device of the devil to fill our minds with a confident belief of it while we are still in our course."[59]

57. J. C. Bennett, *Christianity and Communism* (S.C.M., 1949), p. 94.
58. J. Calvin, *Institutes*, III. 7, *op. cit.* Vol. I, p. 621.
59. J. Calvin, *Institutes*, IV. 1, tr. by H. Beveridge (T. & T. Clark, 1879), p. 297.

The Minister As Pastor[1]

JAMES D. SMART

THE pastoral ministry is an area in which there seems to be great confusion and uncertainty today. We are in need of clarification at two points: what we mean by the word "pastor" and in what way the pastoral office belongs to the essential nature of the ministry. In short, we must rethink and restate the theological basis of this aspect of the ministry.

I. What is a Pastor?

Anyone who attempts to investigate this subject must feel a little like Christopher Columbus embarking on uncharted seas. There is a remarkable scarcity of literature on the theological basis and definition of the pastoral office. Like other areas of the practical ministry such as homiletics and Christian education this area has suffered from theological neglect. The idea has been abroad that these so-called practical areas require no such thorough theological investigation as we give to the areas of Biblical interpretation, systematic theology and church history. For Christian education it was long considered important to know educational theory and techniques but not too much theology; in fact until recently one could get by with very little theology. In homiletics the important thing was to be an expert in the preparation and delivery of sermons and it was expected that the theological content of the sermons would be taken care of in other departments of the seminary. So also for pastoral theology, the emphasis has not been upon theology but rather upon the learning of techniques in the work of a parish. The consequences have been that in all three divisions of practical theology the literature for a long time has tended to be functional rather than theological and that often there has been an embarrassing question mark hanging over the practical disciplines in our seminaries concerning their right to call themselves in the full sense *theological* disciplines. For instance, Paul Tillich in his *Systematic Theology* seems to locate the practical disciplines outside the structure of theology proper as constituting a kind of trade school in which techniques of the ministry are learned. We may object to that, but we must recognize that it merely codifies an order which we have permitted to exist very widely.

This order has had serious consequences in the life of the Church. The lack of thorough theological investigation in the practical fields has left them open to confusion. The Niebuhr-Williams report on the ministry and theo-

1. One of two lectures delivered as the Weber Memorial Lectures at the Moravian Theological Seminary in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

logical education, based on a careful assembling of data from most of the Protestant churches in America and from a very large number of seminaries, states unequivocally that American Protestantism has no clear conception what the ministry is and that in every denomination there are widely varying conceptions in competition with each other. But is that confusion surprising when one searches through the literature on the ministry and finds not one volume that deals thoroughly with the biblical and theological foundations of the ministry? Or consider the chaotic state of affairs in religious education only a few years ago. In Harrison Elliott's "Can Religious Education be Christian?" published as recently as 1940 he vehemently repudiated theological concern as an intruder in the area of religious education, and called for a radical break with the whole historic theological tradition of the Church. John Dewey was to be more significant for future developments than John the Apostle or John Calvin. For lack of seriously critical theological self-consideration religious education came very close to losing itself in a confusion of humanistic philosophy with Christianity.

But has there been any less confusion in our American preaching? The report comes in from every quarter that our Protestant preaching is in a very bad way, that large numbers of our ministers, in spite of three years in seminary and classes in homiletics, do not seem to know why they are in the pulpit, and that from those pulpits sounds a babel of gospels that is strangely and disturbingly like the confusion of tongues in the eleventh chapter of Genesis. Why should it be hard to find a pulpit in which a man Sunday by Sunday is opening the Scriptures intelligently and meaningfully and letting them speak their word from God into the problems and distresses of our twentieth century life? Why is there this chaos in our preaching? It is certainly not unrelated to it that there has been a neglect of critical theological investigation and definition in homiletics. We have stumbled into chaos in our engrossment in practical and technical concerns.

In pastoral theology we find the same confusion and the same theological neglect. What does it mean to be a pastor? There is an evangelistic conception which says that the minister must preach the gospel from house to house and attempt the conversion of people as individuals and not just in the mass. There is a less evangelistic but religiously formal conception which merely insists that a minister read and pray, that is, conduct worship in the homes of his people once each year. I imagine that these two conceptions belong largely to the past. Then there is the friendly church-visitor conception based on the principle that a home-going minister makes a church-going people. There are men in large congregations who make ten-minute calls in every home every six months and thereby keep their people under a sense of obligation to go to church. The content of the call is quite secondary; in ten minutes no serious conversation on any subject can be expected. More recently there has been the counsellor conception in which general visitation of a congregation is abandoned and people with problems are encouraged to visit the minister in his study. This focusses the attention on problem cases

and it is only natural that psychology, psychiatry and psychoanalysis have been drawn into consideration to contribute what help they can in the treatment of such cases. But the tendency has been for this counselling task to be regarded as the whole pastoral task and for the term counsellor to replace that of pastor. Taking the picture as a whole, is it any wonder that the young graduate is not too clear in his mind about his pastoral office? The picture is confused, and again, in this confusion there has been a lack of critical theological thinking and writing which would clarify the situation. There has recently been one courageous attempt to provide a theological preface to pastoral theology—by Seward Hiltner. He acknowledges the pioneer character of his work. He could find little or nothing in our theological literature to provide guidance in his venture. Most American works published on the subject, Hiltner asserts, have been mere "hints and helps for ministers." Unfortunately Hiltner himself does not set his subject in its full theological context but proceeds from a viewpoint limited severely by his own concentration upon the development of the counselling aspect. For instance, he never once attempts to make clear what the total ministry is of which the pastoral office is one part or to show what relation a pastoral ministry of the present day has to the pastoral ministry of the prophets or of Jesus or of Paul. The result is that he leaves us still in our confusion concerning our responsibility and opportunity as pastors, and concerning the relation of the pastoral function to that of preaching and that of teaching.

It is surely clear that one of the drastic needs of the present is the recovery by the practical disciplines of their thoroughgoing theological character. The task of theology is the investigation of the question of truth and error in every aspect of the Church's life. It is possible for the Church so to preach, so to teach, so to act, so to deal with individuals that it is no longer the Church of Jesus Christ but something else, some other kind of institution. The Church is in constant danger of unconsciously becoming something other than that which it was founded to be, the body of Jesus Christ, in which He continues to live and speak and act among men. To be a theologian in education is therefore to ask whether what we are doing educationally is in its central features and in all its details what we are compelled to do in faithfulness to the gospel of Jesus Christ. To be a theologian in homiletics is to ask what we must preach and how, if in our preaching Jesus Christ is himself to be present, proclaiming the nearness of his kingdom and offering himself to men as their only rightful king and lord. And to be a theologian in pastoral theology is to ask what we must do and what we must not do in our dealing with individuals if our ministry to them is to be in the truest sense a continuation of the pastoral ministry of Jesus Christ himself. That question forces us back into the Scriptures to ask about the origins of a pastoral ministry. It makes us trace its varied formulations through the centuries in the Church, trying always to see which developments were valid and which invalid. It makes us reconsider our doctrinal formulations of the Christian faith to find what it is in our understanding or misunderstanding

of the gospel that incapacitates us for the pastoral office. Thus pastoral theology should be simply the bringing of the whole of theology to a focus upon this one point in the Church's life where it attempts to deal with human beings not in the mass but as individuals or in intimate groups, family or otherwise.

There are several other factors in the situation that should be mentioned at this point. In contrast to the counselling programs which require large amounts of time to be spent with people who have acute problems, is a tendency, encouraged by our American accent on bigness, to be impatient with spending time on individuals or small groups. It seems to be more efficient to use the available time to reach people on a broader scale. It is very easy for us in a day when numbers are counted important to become blind to the opportunity which we have only when we are confronted with one person and to forget that the Church is built not by sweeping masses of people into it but by the awakening of faith in single persons, one by one. The mood of our day is against the expenditure of time on careful, painstaking pastoral work. But it is equally true that humanity in our day is acutely in need of pastoral care for this very reason, that individuals feel themselves lost in the impersonal mass of modern society. They are conscious of being manipulated in the mass by the clever advertisers of cigarettes, deodorants and all the rest, and they are caught up into a mechanical round of activities both inside and outside the home in which there is little that is distinctively their own. They are in danger of becoming units in a mass society rather than persons. And even in the Church there is danger that they may be nameless units in a mass rather than persons in a community. This is one reason why it is important today for a minister to know his people's names, and not just those of the adults but also those of the children. It is well for him to know much more than the name but certainly it is true that to be called by name brings always a sense of being recognized as a person. To be nameless in a community is to be a unit and not a person. One of the important functions of pastoral work is to contribute to the transformation of an aggregation of units into a community of persons.

Part of this same problem is the fact that many people have no one either in the home or among their friends with whom they can discuss freely doubts or difficulties that they have in relation to the Christian faith or questions that trouble them at the very centre of their existence. The more important their problems the less is the likelihood that they will have anyone with whom to talk. The Christian Church should be a fellowship in which they would find the opportunity they need and in which they would be able to bring such questions into the open, but only too often the fellowship in a church remains on too superficial a level. It is imperative, therefore, that the minister make himself available to his people at this point of need, establishing in their minds the confidence that they can open up to him freely any question that may be of concern to them. That confidence is not built in a moment, and it is never built unless the minister struggles against the current ten-

dency to spend his time with his people in friendly, superficial and purposeless conversation.

For some ministers the development of a counselling program has meant the abandonment of all attempts to visit in the homes of their people. The minister is available in his study at certain hours for persons who need his help. Beyond this he visits the sick and the dying and persons in special need. In this way his time seems to be used to best advantage. A program of home to home visitation, he says, is too wasteful of time and can easily be merely a succession of social calls, expected by the people, but not intended by them to have any spiritual significance. Moreover, if the calls are made in the afternoon he sees only the woman of the house and it is a bit unmanly for a a minister to spend his afternoons visiting with the women of the congregation. In defending a measure of home to home visitation, it is necessary first of all to make clear that it is an insufferable bondage when a minister feels compelled to call on each home once in every so many months. That may be a major impediment in an effective pastoral ministry. No call should ever be made without a purpose. But when the minister ceases to go into the homes, and meets his people as individuals only when their problems become sufficiently acute to make them seek him out in his study, there are serious losses involved. First, there is a narrowing of his pastoral ministry to the acute problem cases so that he ceases to get near the host of others with less acute but no less real or important problems. Second, there is a misunderstanding of the pastoral office as though its one concern were with people's spiritual problems. The pastoral office should have in it as many concerns as there are in the total ministry of Jesus Christ. There are times when in pastoral conversation the need is to tell the person plainly and convincingly what the gospel has to say to him, in short to preach the gospel—but woe betide the pastor who preaches to an individual as though he were speaking from a pulpit to a congregation. More often there are opportunities for teaching, though again it should be in such a form that the person is unaware that he is being taught. To him it will be merely an interesting and profitable conversation, but to the minister it will be a part of his teaching ministry. Both the preaching and the teaching ministries need to be brought to bear upon the pastoral ministry in order to give it content and purpose. It is not sufficient to do our preaching in the pulpit and our teaching in classes in the church. We need to go to people where they are living and in conversation with them take up our ministry to them so that we speak in direct relation to where they are in their growth in the Christian faith. It is in such conversations that they will uncover their problems and difficulties to us before they become acute. This broader type of pastoral care we might liken to preventive medicine, by which the spiritual health of a people is maintained and guarded, and, if there were more of it being practised, there would be fewer acute problem cases demanding special attention.

II. The Theology of the Pastoral Office

Enough has been said to indicate the complexity of the problem that confronts us and the need for a rethinking of the nature of the pastoral office. The starting-point for any such rethinking should be an examination of the nature of the ministry in the Scriptures and particularly as it finds its definitive expression in Jesus Christ.

Already in the Old Testament the lines of a pastoral ministry begin to appear. The earliest function of the priest was not the offering of sacrifice but the giving of Torah, which is not just law but also direction and instruction. The priest was the custodian of the nation's religious tradition; to him the people were supposed to be able to turn for understanding and guidance in all problems that involved their relationship with God. To Hosea the irresponsibility of the priests was that they themselves no longer had any true knowledge of the God in whose name they ministered. We usually think of the prophet as thundering his messages of doom at the nation as a whole rather than dealing with individuals, a preacher rather than a pastor. But if we look more closely we find that, even though the public oracles are invariably directed to the nation, there are clear indications of the prophet's concern with individuals. Isaiah had a group of disciples with whom he was intimately concerned. Jeremiah thinks of prophets and priests as physicians whose task is to deal with the wound in the nation's life (6:13, 14). Ezekiel describes the prophet as a shepherd and watchman over the community who is responsible to God for the life of each member of the community (3:16ff.). If they die in their sin without having received his warning, their blood is upon his head. This awesome conception of the prophet's responsibility for his people was to be taken up by Paul into his understanding of the Christian ministry (Acts 20:26, 27). It is in Second Isaiah, however, that the pastoral concern of the prophet comes to clearest expression. He describes himself as listening each morning for a word from God with which to strengthen the fainting courage of his people (50:4ff.). There is evidence at various points in his book of a group of believers clustered about him and looking to him for guidance and help. There is evidence also that, where he found his people unfaithful to God, he had no hesitation in pointing out to them where they were going astray, even though he earned the enmity of some of them in return for his care.

In the ministry of Jesus this focus upon individuals comes into much greater prominence, so much so that for some people his prophetic mission to the nation as a whole is lost from sight. If we examine the material in the gospels which formed the substance of Jesus' preaching and teaching, we shall find a large part of it with the stamp upon it not of addresses to large audiences but rather of conversations with individuals and small groups. The Sermon on the Mount, for instance, is best understood as having been addressed to a group of committed disciples rather than to a mixed multi-

tude. The gospels are full of incidents where Jesus is represented as speaking to one or two people, so that much of his most familiar teachings were given in a pastoral situation. If we were to take out of the gospels all the passages in which Jesus is acting as pastor, there would be a great void.

It is also plain that Jesus thought of himself as pastor. In one familiar passage he describes himself at a physician, sent not to all men indiscriminately but to the sick, and therefore justified in going only to those who need him most. John's gospel represents him as calling himself "the good shepherd" and as not only knowing each of his sheep by name but as being known by each of them. It is one thing for the pastor to know his people; it is something different, something much more important and much more costly to him, to let himself be known to them. Jesus' pastoral relationship with his disciples and with others was one in which he laid himself open to them in an unconditional way, interpenetrated their situation with his love and understanding and took upon himself the burden of their sins, distresses and anxieties. He gave himself to them, not in any sentimental way but in the profoundest identification of himself with them. He made himself one with them so that they were conscious of him not judging them from without but understanding them from within.

The striking feature, however, in almost all accounts of Jesus' pastoral dealings with individuals is that the profundity of his understanding is accompanied by what can only be called a drastic surgical approach to the person's problem. The rich young ruler approached Jesus with great respect and with a frank admission that his highly moral and religious achievement was insufficient, but Jesus, probing to the root of his problem, the ultimate mastery of his soul by his possessions, confronted him with a choice between God and possessions. Nicodemus, a learned man, when he engaged Jesus in conversation, was abruptly confronted with the ultimatum that no man could know anything of God's kingdom unless he was born of the Spirit. With Zacchaeus a transformation was effected simply by Jesus' acceptance of him in a situation where he was experiencing rejection from all his fellow townsmen. Simon the Pharisee heard from Jesus a parable which told him that he was nothing more than a bankrupt with God and that his failure to recognize his dependence upon God's mercy made him a merciless and loveless man (Luke 7:35ff.). The lawyer who asked Jesus to define a neighbor received an answer in the parable of the good Samaritan that must have left him gasping and angry. The general impression is that Jesus' methods in his public relations were not in the best modern tradition. He was not concerned primarily with keeping people friendly and loyal to him or to his movement. By his abruptness and even offensiveness he must have lost many people like the rich young ruler who could have been won over and incorporated into the Church by any modern pastor. The difference arises from the fact that so often today the aim of pastoral work is primarily to keep people friendly and loyal toward the church. Jesus' primary aim had to do with the relation of the person to God, the laying bare of the

hidden obstacles to his true life in God and the conquest of those obstacles. He preferred to lose the man for the time being rather than for the sake of a superficial friendliness and a deceptive intimacy to leave the man in the dark about himself. His first responsibility was to speak the truth to each man in love. In short, as a pastor he was discharging his full ministry in immediate confrontation with individuals, speaking to them in the most informal conversational way the word which had in it for them both God's judgment upon them and the power of God to redeem them.

Another feature of Jesus' pastoral ministry was his increasing focus on people who for some reason or other felt themselves excluded from the religious community. At the beginning of his ministry he is frequently reported present in the synagogue, but, as the resistance of the religious community to his gospel grew, he turned more and more to the outsiders. The parable of the lost sheep, which was spoken in defence of that policy, reveals the direction of Jesus' concern. "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." His pastoral ministry was an active search for those who needed him most and who, by the absence of religious and moral defences against his claims upon them, were most likely to respond to his approach. The ninety-nine sheep safely in the fold are plainly the good, loyal, respectable members of the synagogue. That Jesus considered them safe in God's fold can no more be deduced from the parable than that Jesus considered the Pharisees genuinely righteous and healthy can be deduced from Mark 2:17. The exact opposite is evident in the parable told by Jesus to Simon the Pharisee in Luke 7:41. To Jesus all men were sick and sinful and therefore in need of pardon and healing from God. But until men knew they were sick and sinful he could do little for them. He found the outsiders much more ready to acknowledge their need. It is important also to note that Jesus went in search of those who needed him and did not wait for them to come to him. One of the differences between Jesus and John the Baptist was that where John proclaimed his message in the barren Jordan region and waited for men to come to him, Jesus travelled from place to place in search of men. This characteristic of his mission which is of such significance for the entire outlook of the church was rooted in the nature of the love of God which must invade the world in search of the objects of its care. Jesus was a pastor not just because he was interested in people or for the sake of attaching people to his movement, but because he could not be the One in whom God's saving love dwelt in all its fullness without being a shepherd hunting through the highways and byways of Palestine for his lost sheep.

It would carry us too far afield to consider passages bearing on the pastoral office in the remainder of the New Testament. As it is, we have made only a sampling of evidence from the gospels. But the sampling is sufficient to suggest to us that our current conceptions of a pastor are not very closely in line with what we see in the gospels and that our rethinking can profitably find its starting-point in the Scriptures. A few specific points stand out most prominently.

First, the word pastor has behind it both for Jesus and for the prophets the concept of shepherd and in Old and New Testament alike the shepherd's responsibility is not limited in any narrow sense. Ezekiel and Second Isaiah as prophet-shepherds in Israel regarded the whole nation as being under their care. Both undoubtedly had groups of believing disciples who clustered about them and profited most from their ministries, but they felt themselves responsible to God even for those who were hostile to them. Jesus, as we have seen, took as his special task of shepherding the reaching of those within the nation who had placed themselves beyond the pale of religion. In contrast, the work of a pastor is today conceived as the exercising of a personal care over the members of a Christian congregation, the visiting of the sick, the aged, the bereaved or those in any special trouble. If the congregation has a large membership, these duties engross a large part of the minister's time, and, if he attempts a yearly house to house visitation, it absorbs all his available time for pastoral work. Thus he finds himself in the disturbing situation of being a shepherd, who, in contradiction to Jesus' parable of the lost sheep, spends all his time, and is expected to spend all his time, in the care of the ninety and nine who are safely in the fold (or at least so consider themselves) and has no time whatsoever to follow Jesus in his pastoral search for lost sheep. Being a good pastor only too easily comes to mean taking such good care of the members of one's congregation that they remain loyal and are not inclined to stray away into other folds where the pastor might be more attentive. At that point there is need for revolution today in the name of Jesus Christ. Congregations need to be told how Jesus defined a pastor and that their congregational life should be so organized and the attitude of the people such that the minister would be liberated to lead the way for others in search of lost sheep in the world outside the church.

That conclusion suggests a second step. The pastoral task both inside and outside the church (for we dare not overlook either area) is so vast that in no community can the work be overtaken by one man. It has been proved in the past that every congregation has in it men and women who, with training, can do very effective pastoral work. It is absolute folly for all the shepherding to be left to one man. We should follow Jesus' example in training the twelve and then the seventy to share the work, building up in each congregation a body of men and women who will be willing to take careful training and to spend themselves in this essential ministry. Only when that happens are minister and people likely to find their way over the wall of the religious community into the world outside where their greatest opportunity lies.

Another point at which Jesus' example sets our practices in question is in the way in which he discharges his full ministry in the pastoral situation. In his dealings with individuals he is both preacher and teacher. He preaches and teaches in a conversational manner which in a measure conceals what he is doing, but nevertheless it is singularly effective preaching and teaching. He does not as pastor do something quite different from what he is doing

in his public ministry. It is here that often today there is a radical discontinuity in our ministries. The preacher and the pastor can be two quite different people. At a ministers' conference some years ago one man spoke for many when he confessed he could preach the gospel fluently as long as he had a pulpit between himself and his people, but, when that formal situation was no longer there and he found himself informally confronted with one of his people, he was tongue-tied and helpless, without a word to say.

There is no severer test in the ministry than that which meets us in the pastoral situation. It tests the integrity of our knowledge, for, while second-hand knowledge, and even second-hand sermons, can sometimes be passed off for the real thing in the pulpit, in personal conversation, eye to eye, we can speak only that which we know for ourselves. It also tests the strength of our understanding and concern in relation to our people when we have to deal not with human problems in general but with the specific problem of one person. So severe and shattering is this test when we first meet it that it is only human that we should try to run away from it. There are various forms of evasion. One is the finding of good reasons for abandoning all visitation in homes. Another is the shortening of the visit to a period so brief that no significant conversation is possible. Another is the resolute maintenance of a chatty superficial level in the interview that effectively discourages serious questions. Yet another is the formal religious visit which gives the minister a good conscience that he has done something to make the call religious when in actuality he has gone into hiding behind his Bible reading and prayer. There are innumerable ways of guarding ourselves against the costly exposure to the rude realities of our people's lives. But when we refuse all such protection and accept this exposed position as the necessary permanent condition of our ministry, profound consequences follow not only for our pastoral work but also for our preaching and teaching. The pastoral situation becomes for us the place where we learn who the people are to whom we preach on Sunday and whom we teach on Thursday. In fact, our preaching becomes a continuation in public of the conversations we have been having in private and retains the quality of personal address in which we seek to speak the word which we have heard in the Scriptures in which God himself deals in judgment and in mercy with our broken, confused, sinful lives.

This continuity of the preaching and pastoral ministries is extremely important in dealing with people who have special problems. Quite often the problem has its origin in an arrested spiritual development. The person is failing in the relationships of life because he has no more than a nine year old's understanding of the Christian faith and has no knowledge of the resources of prayer. What he needs is help in discovering the realities of his situation and in taking the first steps in an independent development in faith and prayer. What must not happen is that he should develop a relation of dependence upon the minister rather than upon God. He should therefore

at the earliest possible moment find in the worship and sermons of the sanctuary the continuation of what began for him in the private conversation. This point is significant in the light of the tendency in some forms of counselling to attach the person to the minister as counsellor and to prolong private interviews over a wide expanse of time.

Finally, the entire pastoral ministry is to be undertaken in full awareness that no person receives a Christian ministry in the midst of his problems and distresses unless somehow his life is brought under the light of God's own presence. We are ministers of God before we are ministers to human need, and our one hope that something effective may be accomplished concerning the person's problem is that through our ministry they may become aware of God's dealings with them; that is, aware that at the root of their problem is something wrong in their relationship with God and that the beginning of healing in their practical problems is the healing and restoration of this inner relationship. We dare not lead them to think that there is something we can do, some word we can speak as ministers, some discipline we can lay upon them, some process of counselling to which we can submit them, which of itself is able to accomplish the desired healing. There are things that men can do to help people in their troubles; that has been proved by the psychologists, pyschiatrists and psychoanalysts; but the help given from these quarters does not claim to be and cannot be the kind of help that comes only from reconciliation with God. It will be a tragic thing if Christian ministers begin to forget that they are ministers of reconciliation in this radical sense that we see exemplified in Jesus' own ministry and exchange this ministry for one which, by copying some of the techniques of the psychiatrists, seems to offer people more direct and immediate help. We need to learn all that we can from psychology, psychiatry and psychoanalysis to deepen our understanding of the people with whom we deal and to guard ourselves against approaches to them which are likely only to complicate their problems. A minister who refuses to learn from these sciences is as irresponsible in his work as pastor as he would be as preacher and teacher if he refused to make use of the biblical researches of the past hundred years in his interpretations of the Bible. We need every help we can find in lifting the edge of darkness that always hides the other person from us. But what must not happen is that the Christian minister should exchange the role of minister of reconciliation with God for the role of a species of amateur psychiatrist. The two are not just the ancient and the modern forms of the same thing.

The pastor, however much he may be helped from many modern sources in his understanding of his people, is not likely to be a minister of reconciliation to them unless he learns to read his own and their inner situation out of the Scriptures. The word of God in Scripture is not just a revelation of God; it is also a revelation of man, and these are not two separate revelations but one. Wherever God reveals himself, man sees himself and his whole life in a new light. The point at which God reveals himself fully in Jesus Christ is the point at which the heights and depths of our humanity are laid bare. Not only the mystery of God but also the mystery of man is pierced by the

word of God. The Bible is therefore the primary textbook of the pastor out of which he reads his people, their problems and the way of their healing. By it he will be kept from all superficial diagnoses of even the least of their problems, for he will learn that what shows as only a tiny problem on the surface may be the only visible evidence of a much larger and deeper problem in the person's life with God. The rich young ruler thought he lacked only some one small thing in his spiritual life when in actuality he had not yet faced the magnitude of the No that he was saying to God. But, above all, the Scriptures keep us aware that the problems of any one man are not in himself alone or merely in his relations with one or two people, so that if he is twisted in himself or tangled in his relation with others we can get him straightened out. The deepest reality of his life is his relation with God and this is the substructure of his relation with himself and with those about him. Therefore all our straightening out of his relations with himself and others leaves the main problem untouched so that at the centre, in his relation with God, a conflict remains out of which at any moment may emerge disruptive forces. He is not really helped until at the centre he is reconciled with God. But this is not something which we or anyone else can accomplish with human techniques. The ultimately decisive help is not ours but God's. The word and spirit of God are his only hope. This is what makes the ministry of the Word and Spirit of such paramount importance. God uses a human ministry that men in the midst of their present problems may hear God himself speaking to them in his word and may know themselves confronted with God himself in his Spirit. Through the ministry of Jesus Christ embodied in us God himself must come to them and reconcile them to himself. *Through* us God must do what neither we nor anyone else can do.

Some years ago Eduard Thurneysen, until lately minister of the cathedral and professor of homiletics in Basel, published an article on "Justification by Faith and the Pastor's Task" in which he warned the ministry against raising false expectations in people's minds. Only too easily do people begin to think that we as pastors can solve their problems for them and this impression is reinforced when they hear from a number of people that a certain minister has been most successful in solving people's problems. Some ministers begin even to be advertised as experts in this respect. Thurneysen pointed out that, if justification by faith is the ultimate need of each of these people, we dare not do anything that will lead them to trust in solutions of their problems on a more superficial level. Our task before all else is to expose the real problem of their existence which is hidden behind the complex of difficulties visible to them. This is another way of saying that we must be ministers of God to them, bringing to them the good news that God has acted decisively to meet the real problem of their life so that they must give up all attempts to find some form of justification for themselves and receive as a gift from God his justification of them in Jesus Christ. A pastoral ministry of this kind is much more exacting and dangerous than any other kind, but it can be undertaken with a confidence that in it we are beginning to share in the pastoral ministry of our Lord himself.

Plain Talk in the Pulpit

NEIL GREGOR SMITH

ONE of the bottlenecks in the communication of the Christian message is the lack of plain talk in the pulpit. By the time a student enters a theological seminary he has acquired the rudiments of a literary style. Most of his efforts at self-expression have been directed towards the cultivation of such a style. Before he is admitted to the seminary he has had to write essays and examinations in which he employed a literary style to demonstrate his knowledge to, or conceal his ignorance from, his instructors. His style may leave much to be desired, but such as it is his style is a literary one.

When he begins to preach he is strongly inclined to carry over his literary style to the pulpit. His first sermons—and sometimes all his sermons—are pious and theological essays delivered orally. The warnings he receives from his instructors or from his text books on homiletics about the difference between an oral and a literary style often go unheeded, with the result that he continues to speak in the pulpit as he writes in his study.

The tragedy of this situation is that the best students are likely to be handicapped most by the transfer of their literary style to the pulpit. Those who can "get by" in the pulpit with little study and preparation, those who have the unholy combination of "ignorance, indolence and impudence" which permits them to speak extemporaneously in the pulpit are very often able to communicate more effectively than their studious brethren who have expended care and thought on the preparation of their messages, and then deliver them in a style and language that are remote from the language of the people.

I

This situation has existed in the church for a long time. In 1670 John Eachard complained bitterly about the unintelligible, unnatural, and uncommunicative speech of the pulpit. In his tract, *The Ground and Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy Enquired Into*, he attributed many of the faults of contemporary preaching to the unnatural style developed in the universities. Here young men acquired a taste for "hard words and lofty notions."

> And the misery of it is that this pernicious accustomed way of expression does not only, ofttimes, go along with them to their benefice, but accompanies them to the very grave. And for the most part an ordinary cheesemonger or plum-seller that scarce ever heard of a University shall write much better sense, and more to the purpose than these young philosophers, who injudiciously hunting only for great words, make themselves learnedly ridiculous.[1]

1. Eachard's tract is reprinted in Edward Arber's *English Garner* (1888) v. 7. The quotation is from v. 7, p. 263.

The demand for the cultivation of the "plain style" in preaching was a protest against the divorce of the language of the pulpit from the language of the people. Samuel Johnson attributed the success of the Methodist preachers to the fact they expressed themselves "in plain and familiar manner, which is the only way to do good to the common people."[2] John Wesley deliberately cultivated a plain style. In a letter to a young clergyman he indicates that he had expended a considerable effort to develop a plain style:

> Clearness in particular is necessary for you and me, because we are to instruct people of the lowest understanding. Therefore we, above all, if we think with the wise, yet must speak with the vulgar. We should constantly use the common, little, easy words (so they are pure and proper) which our language affords. When I had been a member of the University about ten years I wrote and talked much as you do now. But when I talked to plain people in the Castle or the town, I observed they gaped and stared. This quickly obliged me to alter my style and adopt the language of those I spoke to.[3]

Anyone who wants to communicate in the pulpit must make a comparable effort to express himself in the language of the people.

In pioneer communities on this continent the regularly trained clergy of the orthodox churches were often less successful in gathering congregations and building up the church than semi-literate circuit riders. Such men as Lorenze Dow and Peter Cartwright had little formal education, but they were able to communicate effectively with their audiences because they spoke in the common idiom. The regularly trained clergy sometimes failed where these men succeeded. Peter Cartwright stated:

> I do not wish to undervalue education, but really I have seen so many of these educated preachers who forcibly reminded me of lettuce growing under the shade of a peach tree, or like a gosling that had got the straddle by wading in the dew, that I turn away sick and faint.[4]

He tells of a Presbyterian minister who was "a pious, good man, much devoted to prayer," who laboured for a time in Springfield with little success:

> He was a very well educated man, and had regularly studied theology in some of the Eastern states. . . . He brought with him a number of old manuscript sermons and read them to the people. . . . He soon saw and felt that he had no adaptation to the country or the people. I told him he must quit reading his old manuscript sermons, and learn to speak extemporaneously: that the Western people were born and reared in hard times, and were an outspoken and off-hand people; that if he did not adopt this manner of preaching, the Methodists would set the whole Western world on fire before he would light his match.[5]

After a short and unhappy ministry he left for parts unknown. This pattern of learning, piety and zeal being short-circuited because of uncommunicative preaching was repeated endlessly.

2. James Boswell, *Life of Samuel Johnson* (July 30, 1763).
3. Letter dated July 15, 1764, in George Eayrs, *Letters of John Wesley* (1915), p. 457.
4. Peter Cartwright, *Autobiography*, edited by C. L. Wallis (N.Y., Abingdon, 1956), p. 64.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 204.

There is reason to fear that it is still being repeated. The growth of the cults may be due, in part at least, to the fact that their spokesmen are more skilled than our orthodox clergy in communicating with the people. What the propagandists of the cults have to say may be thin in content and faulty in logic, but if it holds the attention and captures the interest of those addressed it may succeed where orthodox preaching fails. In writing of the growth of the cults in Alberta, W. E. Mann noted that the Bible Colleges and training institutes gave their graduates skills useful in the pastorate, and placed particular emphasis upon their courses in public speaking.

> At the Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute, for example, the public speaking course dealt with all the devices of mass appeal, such as the use of the voice, gesture and timing and the importance of imagery. The result was that Bible school graduates were usually impressive speakers.[6]

In this connection he quotes an Alberta pastor making a statement which is very similar in its import to the statement made by Peter Cartwright:

> The theological colleges are on the spot. They can't give a man the real training for preaching, and when the men get out here they don't know how to go about their job, and their sermons are dull.[7]

In speaking to the students of the Free Church College, Glasgow, in 1880, Marcus Dods observed that the church's colleges turned out educated theologians who were unable to communicate their knowledge.

> There is a greater waste of the raw material of good preaching among ourselves than, I suppose, among any other body of Christians. . . . Our young ministers are full of unavailable resources, and are as helpless in presence of a congregation as a historian in presence of an invading army.[8]

The waste continues, and our seminary graduates are still filled with unavailable resources.

All this is not an argument for less attention to be given to the content of preaching. It is an argument for more attention to be given to the style of preaching. Particularly it is an argument for more attention to be given to the cultivation of an oral style in preaching.

II

From the time of Aristotle it has been recognized that there is a difference between the oral and the literary styles, between words arranged to be heard by the ear, and words arranged to be read by the eye. Speech and writing are two different media of communication. What is effective in one may not be effective in the other. As one might expect, the people who are concerned with broadcast speech are particularly sensitive to the difference which

6. W. E. Mann, *Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta* (Toronto, University Press, 1955), p. 102.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
8. Lecture, *On Preaching* in *Erasmus and other Essays* (1892), p. 318.

exists between the two media. In the *Broadcast Word*, A. Lloyd James is emphatic in stating the difference between the language of speech and the language of writing:

> The so-called literary language, a thing unfit for speech, unsuited to the rough and tumble of life, has dominated us for centuries. It is worshipped by everybody. Those who cannot use it are refused admittance to schools and colleges: prigs and pedants try to speak it; and unhappy people, who ought to know better, have come to regard its rules and regulations as binding upon the daily converse of their lives.[9]

He insists that writing is one thing, and speaking is another, and that the real language of speech can never be written:

> Its medium is not the printed word, but the lively, colourful, vigorous aspect of human behaviour that men call speech. And nothing that man can do will put any of it on paper. It dwells apart in the realm of sound: the eye has never seen it, nor the hand made it.[10]

The language of preaching is the language of speech. The manuscript of a sermon bears the same relation to a sermon preached as the script of a play to the play delivered on the stage. The play comes to life when the black marks on the script are communicated through the words and actions of the players. The sermon comes to life when the black marks on the manuscript are communicated through the voice and gestures of the preacher.

In his autobiography Edwin Bok tells of sending a report of an interview with Mark Twain for the author's approval. Mark Twain replied that while the report was an accurate transcript of what he had said during the interview he did not want it published.

> No, no—it is like most interviews, pure twaddle, and valueless. For several quite plain and simple reasons an interview must, as a rule, be an absurdity. And chiefly for this reason; it is an attempt to use a boat on land, or a wagon on water, to speak figuratively. Spoken speech is one thing, written speech is quite another. Print is a proper vehicle for the latter, but it isn't for the former. The moment talk is put into print you recognize that it is not what it was when you heard it; you perceive that an immense something has disappeared from it. That is its soul. You have nothing but a dead carcass left on your hands. Color, play of feature, and the varying modulations of voice, the laugh, the smile, the informing inflections, everything that gave that body warmth, grace, friendliness and charm, and commended it to your affection, or at least to your tolerance, is gone, and nothing is left but a palid, stiff, and repulsive cadaver.[11]

One of the disadvantages of attempting to develop a sermonic style through a study of the printed sermons of successful preachers lies in this difference which exists between speech and print. No transcript of a speech or sermon can record the pauses, the hesitations, or the subtle intonations which may have been used in the oral delivery of the material studied. There is also the possibility that in being edited for publication certain features of the oral

9. A. Lloyd James, *The Broadcast Word* (London, 1935), p. 4.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
11. *The Americanization of Edward Bok* (N.Y., 1937), p. 205.

style may have vanished. The printed text of a speech or sermon is, as Mark Twain said of Bok's report of his interview, a carcass from which the life has fled.

III

Since there is this difference between speech and writing, the effectiveness of the sermon, as a medium of communication, depends largely upon its adaptation to the medium of speech. Henry Ward Beecher, who knew quite a lot about the art of preaching, was emphatic in urging that the preacher should avoid the literary style.

> Above all other men the preacher should avoid what may be called a literary style as distinguished from a natural one: and by a "literary style," technically so called, I understand one in which abound these two elements—the artificial structure of sentences, and the use of words and phrases peculiar to literature alone, and not to common life. Involved sentences, crooked, circuitous and parenthetical, no matter how musically they may be balanced, are prejudicial to a facile understanding of the truth.[12]

It will be noticed that this prescription for pulpit style is couched in negative terms, as the avoidance of the artificial structure of the literary sentence, the avoidance of literary language, and the avoidance of expressions which may be prejudicial to ease of comprehension. Positively the prescription may be given as adapting plain talk to the pulpit, and transferring to pulpit discourse the idiom of conversation.

Probably no cut and dried formula can ever be given for an effective oral style, because there are an infinite number of such styles. People do not speak alike in conversation. Our talk reflects our training, our background, our reading, and our habits of thought. Boswell reports that when Samuel Johnson was on his death-bed his physician, in his best bedside manner expressed the hope that he was better. Johnson answered "No, sir. You cannot conceive with what acceleration I advance towards death!" He was speaking in a manner which was habitual with him. Long habits of precision of speech and an unusually rich vocabulary gave him a conversational style which, in most people, would have sounded ridiculously pompous. To him it was natural. It is possible that an effective oral style may vary from individual to individual and yet be a natural, unaffected and sincere form of expression.

In public discourse the style adopted should not only be a style suited to the habits, temperament and character of the speaker; it must also *appear* as natural to the audience. An actor on the stage has to exaggerate certain movements and gestures to make them appear "natural" to an audience viewing them from a distance. He has to exaggerate certain emphases in his speeches to have an emphasis apparent at all. It is possible that an effective oral style in public discourse may require that the speaker be "a bit of an actor" to give an impression of naturalness. To speak to two or

12. H. W. Beecher, *Yale Lectures on Preaching,* First series, Lecture IX.

three hundred people at once is not a natural setting for conversation. To develop a conversational style of delivery in this setting requires—paradoxical as it may seem—some degree of artifice.

While recognizing that wide variations may exist in effective oral styles it is possible to single out certain factors which are likely to contribute to the effectiveness of pulpit discourse. Certain elements of plain talk can be carried, with advantage, into the pulpit.

Plain talk, for instance, is always adapted to a particular audience on a particular occasion. The literary style is more general, because the man who writes is aware that he is addressing an unseen audience in a variety of situations. The man who speaks is addressing a specific group in a specific situation. There can be an intimacy and warmth in speech which cannot be conveyed in writing. The intimacy may be expressed in a greater use of personal pronouns, "I," "you," "we," "us," "our," and so on.[13] It may be expressed in personal references, in references to the immediate situation, or to items and experiences of which speaker and audience share a common knowledge. In some way the bridge between the "cold, celestial certainties" and living men and women in the audience, must be crossed by the speaker. He must strive to make them feel that this message is for them in particular. Phillips Brooks once observed that the main difference in sermons is that some sermons are, and other sermons are not, conscious of an audience. If they are conscious of the audience they are "enthusiastic, personal, warm." If not, they are "calm, abstract, cold."[14]

Plain talk is less formal and less precise than literary composition. Contractions and colloquial expressions which one would hesitate to use in print are not only quite acceptable, but quite effective in speech. Words and expressions may have long currency in common speech before they gain acceptance in literary usage. Effective public discourse will always be closer to conversational usage than to literary usage.

Transitions between ideas, and the order followed in the arrangement of ideas, are normally more important in oral than in literary usage. If we fail on a first reading to see the connection between one paragraph and the next, or between one thought and another, we can go back over what we have read, or pause to reflect. In listening to oral discourse there are no such opportunities. The connection between one step in an argument and the next must be seen at once, or it is not likely to be seen at all. As applied to the sermon this consideration suggests the value of a carefully planned structure, with divisions of thought which are obvious to the listener, and which have a logical and a climatic order.

Oral style, finally, is marked by vividness, energy, and forcefulness. Complex sentences, complicated syntax which obscures thought and meaning

13. Helpful studies of characteristics of oral style are given in Gladys Borcher, "An Approach to the Problem of Oral Style," *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* XXII, 2 (1936), p. 114ff., and C. H. Woolbert, "Speaking and Writing—A study of differences," *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* VIII, 3 (1922), pp. 271–285.

14. Phillips Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching* (1886), p. 172.

should be studiously avoided. The spoken word must have immediate intelligibility. Words carrying emotional overtones, words which have familiar associations, and which call up images in the minds of the listeners, give to oral style a forcefulness which is direct and vivid. It was sound advice which Henry Ward Beecher gave when he counselled preachers to use homely words:

> Use homely words—those which people are used to, and which suggest many things to them. The words that we heard in our childhood store up in themselves sweetness and flavor that make them precious all our life long afterwards. . . .The words which, from the cradle to the grave, have been the vehicles of love, trust, praise, hope, joy, anger, and hate, are not simply words, but like paper, are what they are by virtue of the things written on them.[15]

Words which have had long experience written into them, memories of sensations of sight, sound, taste, or movement, are useful in any style, but particularly so in an oral style. The preacher, as an artist in words—and he is an artist in the sense that he is striving to create an effect with words—should be as sensitive as the poet to the connotation and the sound of words. As Pope expressed it:

> 'Tis not enough no harshness gives offence:
> The sound must seem an echo of the sense.

The substitution of the word *rings* would ruin the effect of the line,

> The curfew tolls the knell of parting day.

Cardinal Wolsey's farewell speech would be marred if he had spoken of being left *nude* to his enemies instead of *naked* to his enemies. By the dictionary *rings* and *tolls*, *nude* and *naked* may be identical in meaning. They are not identical in the total meaning they convey. The more sensitive we become to this element in speech, the echoic qualities of words, their emotional overtones, which are not charted in the lexicons, the better use we can make of the arts of language.

IV

If it is difficult to give a definition of what constitutes an oral style it is even more difficult to attempt to give a prescription for acquiring it. The first step is probably that of recognizing the difference which does exist between the two styles employed in effective writing and effective speech, and to shape the sermon, from the first stages of its planning, to the polishing of the final draft, for oral delivery.

The second step which may be suggested is to expend more effort than most of us have been disposed to spend on the structure and diction of our sermons. The better our material is, the more is it deserving of being expressed as effectively as possible. If John Henry Newman had to write

15. *Lectures on Preaching*, First series, Lecture IX.

out his sermons three times, perhaps some us should write ours at least twice. Cicero and Quintilian, whom the ancients regarded as masters of the oral style, asserted that the pen was the best teacher of eloquence.

> It is in writing that eloquence has its roots and foundations; it is writing that provides that holy of holies where the wealth of oratory is stored, and whence it is produced to meet the demand of sudden emergencies.[16]

All this brings us to the paradoxical position of asserting that the best means of developing an oral style is to develop a literary style. The development of an ear for words, for enrichment of vocabulary, the facility in the use of words which come through careful writing contribute to forcefulness and precision in speech. The more sensitive we become to the sounds and rhythms and patterns of language the more aware we are likely to be of the difference between speech and writing. The seminarian's acquisition of a literary style is not necessarily a handicap to the quest for plain talk in the pulpit. It can lead, and should lead, to plain talk with good sense.

16. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria,* Book X, iii, 3.

Book Reviews

Mystery and Meaning in the Christian Faith. By Hugh T. Kerr. Toronto: The Ryerson Press (*The Saddlebag Series*), 1958. Pp. 51. $1.00.

This volume in Ryerson's pleasant new paper-back series consists of four lectures given at Emmanuel College, Toronto, in 1957 by a professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. Dr. Kerr's thesis is that mystery and meaning are correlative terms and not exclusive alternatives. Starting from St. Paul's linking of mystery with revelation he argues that the modern world had lost the sense of mystery but has recently begun to rediscover it. This rediscovery, he believes, can be seen in the revolt against traditional systems of meaning which is most evident in the world of art, and it has led to a new appreciation of the role of symbolism in human existence. He ends by suggesting that the tension between mystery and meaning in the realm of faith is very relevant to the communication of the Gospel—something that can "put life into theology, and theology into life."

To speak about religion is to speak about mystery, as Michael Foster has reminded us in his *Mystery and Philosophy* (recently reviewed in this Journal). Dr. Kerr has given a lively introduction to a living issue, pointing out names and currents of thought likely to be useful to any one who wants to explore this territory for himself. That is no small achievement and probably all that a little book ought to attempt. Yet even a very brief introduction to a very large subject can prepare the way for investigations which it cannot do more than indicate, and this is perhaps where Dr. Kerr is least helpful.

Logically preceding the question, "How shall we relate meaning to mystery?" is the question, "How shall we draw the limits of meaning?" Only after the question of meaning has been answered is it profitable to ask the question of mystery, and it is the answer to the more fundamental question which distinguishes different types of philosophy and theology. Dr. Kerr ignores this vital point in his analysis. He claims support for his correlation between mystery and meaning, for example, from Gabriel Marcel and Stuart Hampshire, from Paul Tillich and Karl Barth. But what is most obvious about these thinkers is not that they allow different *degrees* of mystery to find a place in their thinking but that the element of "mystery" in their systems is in each case a different *kind*. The first-named in each pair define meaning so differently from the second that they could never come to agreement about *the meaning of mystery.*

Yet, when the acids of criticism have done their worst, this short work remains one which is topical, provocative and well worth reading.

Kenneth Hamilton

United College
Winnipeg, Man.

Protestant Faith and Life. By EDWARD CRAGG. Toronto: The Ryerson Press (*The Saddlebag Series*), 1958. Pp. 58. $1.00.

THIS LITTLE BOOK is alive. Clarity and simplicity of style keep feeling and conviction within due bounds. Particularly in the treatment of the evangelical aspects of the Christian Faith does the author run on light and sure feet. The place given to the Scriptures has a Protestant ring.

The purpose of the book is to claim Protestants for Protestantism as representative of Apostolic Faith. The author is on safe ground in holding that the authority of the Bible, justification by faith, and the Priesthood of All Believers are the chief marks of protestantism. He makes his position surer throughout the text by his grasp of the principle of freedom which informs the Protestant position. In his use of Roman Catholicism to make Protestant Faith and Life clear, he is temperate in feeling, if not completely so in the selection of data. The reviewer finds the chapters on "The Priesthood of All Believers," "True Worshippers," "The Christian in the World," "Interfaith Marriage" and "The Religious Future," particularly successful.

A book of such slender proportions attempting summary statements on the history of the Early and Medieval Church and set by its title to hold in judicious balance of all the major churches in the Protestant complex, and in brief statements aiming to represent Roman Catholicism, is bound to falter in certain areas. For instance, the author is in error on p. 4 in suggesting that in the 14th and 15th Centuries "the power of the Church to extinguish criticism was almost unchallenged." On p. 5 the printers have transposed numerals. Zwingli's death was in 1531, not 1513. On p. 12 it seems to be suggested that the Protestant Reformers emerged before the invention of the printing press; and a statement on the same page underestimates the number of languages yet to be conquered by the Bible. Luther's reason for entering the monastery was other than that suggested on p. 15.

If Lutheranism is to be represented as Protestant, the treatment of "The Sacraments" in Chapter 6 needs a sound statement on the necessity of faith for their reception. The ease with which infant baptism grew in the Early Church is perhaps misrepresented in the same chapter. Apparently Tertullian stood for many who advocated that baptism be delayed to the last safe moment.

In one or two cases the contrasts between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are too sharp. On p. 29 the Roman Catholic use of the Scriptures merits milder criticism in the light of contemporary conditions. Furthermore, Protestant Bibles are often printed with notes, or with cross references which at times amount to notes.

But we may be grateful for any book which contains the amount of insight and careful preparation which this one does. It is a book which men in pew, pulpit and study can read with profit.

E. M. WHIDDEN

Acadia University
Wolfville, N.S.

The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534–1642. By MILLAR MACLURE. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958. Pp. ix, 261. $5.50.

THE ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR of English in Victoria College has given us the sixth in the University of Toronto Department of English Studies and Texts Series. This is a work of accurate historical description and careful yet lively analysis, a richly informative and lucid monograph, whether one turns to it as student of literature or theology, of social or ecclesiastical or political history.

The author has undertaken a study of one of the lesser known institutions of English life, the outdoor sermons as preached at the Cross in St. Paul's churchyard, London, from the time of the Henrician Reformation to the early 40's of the reign of Charles I. With an economy of words and a minimum of overlapping, the material is organized into chapters on the antiquarian, historical, sociological and homiletic aspects of these unusually influential sermons. A most useful addendum to the book takes the form of an extensive, if not exhaustive, Register of Sermons. The first entry is under the date Jan. 15, 1534, when "the customary prayer for the Pope was omitted" (p. 184), and the last, before 1643, when the Dean of St. Paul's gives "a sober defence of the Church established, against recusants and separatists" (p. 256), the rumblings of revolution being almost audible in the distance. A sound approach to the book would be to examine the Register first, with its general chronological orientation and significant quotations from the sermons, and then to turn to the main text and the author's mature reflections.

The period under discussion was one of turbulent evolution in the life and institutions of England, from the break with Rome, through the Marian reconciliation, to the Elizabethan settlement and the Jacobean struggle for stability in church and state, in the face of continual pressure from Papists and Puritans. The Paul's Cross sermons present an animated and extensive reflection of this controversial and creative age. Originally a place where citizens held folk-moot, the Cross became the principal pulpit of England, and to it repaired audiences of all estates to be regaled with two hours of exhortation and rhetoric, denunciation of sin and political propaganda.

It is not to be thought that there was here a "free pulpit," an open-air forum comparable to the Hyde Park of today. The preachers who cried their wares from Paul's Cross had received mandatory summonses, and were above all mouthpieces for the administration. Here the official voice of the Establishment was promulgated according to the royal will. Here the debate on the sacrament of the altar and the doctrine of the mass was publicly advanced in line with the interests of the secular as well as the religious authority. The preachers were concerned above all with what we are used to calling "security." Little wonder that on many an occasion the sermon was accompanied by public recantation on the part of those who had been brought to heel for dangerous heresy or sedition, as well as by public

penance for scandalous living, or fraud, or other moral lapse. Book-burning, too, was far from unknown. "The two arms, ecclesiastical and secular, were joined in one purpose; the welfare of the commonwealth was, in ideal, an accomplishment to God's glory, and obedience to the sovereign in all matters economic as well as political, a religious duty" (p. 123).

In this context, the full-scale analysis of the Paul's Cross sermons sheds light on the controversy with the Puritan forces, and highlights a fundamental contrast. Although Puritan sympathizers occasionally preached from the Cross, inculcating their veneration of the Scriptures and the pursuit of godliness, the usual preaching from this famed pulpit was directed against the "Precisians," and to no small degree from ecclesiastical and political motives. Its aim was the formation of Christian subjects rather than saints. In an illuminating conclusion, Dr. MacLure contrasts the Puritan whose world is one "in which absolute laws of belief and conduct are ranged like the soldiers of a new model army," with the Anglican "involved in the ordinary flux of the present world, taking account of its varieties and approximations" (p. 171). It is true that the action of God upon the individual soul was the consuming concern of the Puritan; yet too little account is taken of the immense practical effect of Puritan spirituality on English life in the period. The otherworldliness of the Puritans and the more mundane approach to secular life of the Paul's Cross preachers, sketched with understanding and insight, each contributed to the total impact of Christian faith on the nation.

Among the merits of this book, not the least is its literary quality. To a disciplined mastery of his subject, Dr. MacLure brings a deft and precise English style, displaying frequent command of the telling phrase. A certain manner of preaching reflected in a few of the sermons becomes "no more than a dismal set of spiritual jerks" (p. 153). The formula for the usually encyclopaedic nature of a Paul's Cross Sermon is: "Load every rift with ore, and manage it so that almost every word is a rift" (p. 159). There is also an eye for the primary quotation that captures the atmosphere of a moment, an incident, a discourse. An ancient worthy, descanting lengthily on the vain luxury and elaborate trappings of women's clothing, is cited as remarking: "A greate alteration from figge leaves my brethren" (p. 136).

We are indebted to the author for a judicious and highly articulate presentation of a neglected subject. He has depicted and dissected the nature, content, and art of popular preaching in the Church of England at a time when the sermon was a vital force in the national life. One might well wish that, while learning to avoid the pitfalls in the way of maintaining an independent ministry, now, as then, the pulpit in our time might again become as relevant to great issues as it was when the Paul's Cross sermons were being preached.

G. W. Legge

Noranda, Que.

Essays on the Later Stuarts. By GODFREY DAVIES. San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1958. Pp. ix, 133. $4.00.

THE LATE Godfrey Davies was an authority on the seventeenth century whom no student of the period can afford to neglect. His *Bibliography* has been a standard tool for many years. His volume on *The Early Stuarts* (in the *Oxford History of England*) is one of the best studies of the first half of the century. A couple of years ago, he published *The Restoration of Charles II* (San Marino, 1955) and thereby completed the great series of histories inaugurated by S. R. Gardiner, continued by Sir Charles Firth, and now carried forward to 1660. This date seemed to be a natural terminus: the story had been fully told of the rise and fall of the opposition to the house of Stuart. The Puritan experiment had flourished and failed. But Mr. Davies regarded the Restoration as a halting place, not as an end—history, after all, is continuous—and he had planned a further extension of the series. He did not live to complete it, and the three essays here published are preliminary studies which provide some indication of the loss we have sustained through his death.

The first essay is a portrait of Charles II. Mr. Davies takes 1660 as a convenient point for assessing the opinion which contemporaries had formed of Charles, and for checking their estimate against subsequent developments. What emerges is not a flattering picture. Charles was not wholly destitute of engaging attributes. He had intelligence, even though it was not disciplined by industry. He had a quizzical bent of mind, and he regarded many things —including himself and his convictions—with satirical detachment. Compared with the solemn and self-righteous stupidity of most of the Stuarts, he was mentally alert, politically adroit, and shrewd in his judgments of men and affairs. He had the makings of a great figure; indolence and dissipation kept him from realizing his full potentialities. And unquestionably Charles II had many qualities which were very far from estimable. He had little loyalty to his friends, no mercy (save when it involved no cost), little purpose in life (except the avoidance of unnecessary trouble), and little sincerity or honesty. When he came to the throne, hopes were high, and many of the judgments expressed, reflected fervent loyalty rather than a candid assessment of the man as he really was. This was the prevailing attitude at the outset of his reign; it is the more striking that the final picture proved to be so dark. "That the king emerges in so unflattering a light when viewed almost exclusively through royalist eyes is damning" (p. 39).

The second essay considers the relation between James II and the Tory churchmen who so loyally supported his claims to the throne. They were largely responsible for his quiet accession in 1685; three years later they did nothing to prevent his overthrow. This dramatic change involved a revolution in thought as well as a shift in loyalties. James's Catholicizing policy applied the acid test to the favourite Anglican doctrine of passive obedience. The result proved both that James had misunderstood its implications and that many Anglicans had deceived themselves. The final essay in the book

deals with William III's method of conducting foreign policy. For most of his reign he deliberately kept his English advisers as well as parliament itself in ignorance of the commitments in which he had involved them. In the months immediately prior to his death he adopted a totally different approach and awakened a wholly different response.

These essays are the work of an expert whose easy mastery of the subject appears on every page. Mr. Davies was not a brilliant stylist but he was a very sound historian. The book can be warmly commended to all serious students of the period. That it cannot be commended without reservation is perhaps not Mr. Davies' fault. For one thing, the book lacks an index, and this seriously complicates the task of anyone who wishes to verify particular points. Possibly the publishers considered the book too brief to require an index, but surely this is a decision which is determined more by the character of a book than by its size. But the question of size does bear on the dilemma in which inflationary trends have involved those who publish books as well as those who buy them. This work is beautifully produced. The pages are thick, the print is large, the margins are wide. The text contains fewer than 30,000 words; and the price is $4.00. But those who can afford it can rest assured that their investment will procure them a book of unquestioned importance in its field.

GERALD R. CRAGG

Andover Newton Theological School
Massachusetts, U.S.A.

The Church Faces the Isms. Ed. by ARNOLD B. RHODES. New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958. Pp. 304. $4.50.

THIS BOOK is a symposium by the Faculty of Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, under the editorship of Arnold Black Rhodes with Frank Caldwell and L. C. Rudolph as associate editors.

In the Preface it is stated that the purpose of the book is to help Christians, especially leaders in the Church, to prepare themselves to deal effectively and fairly with specific organized and unorganized movements which challenge main-line Protestantism in particular ways. It is explained that the term "main-line Protestantism" refers to that composite body of larger Protestant denominations which have a basic harmony in theological position. The book is intended chiefly for practical rather than for theoretical use and in the light of this provision it would seem to fulfill its purpose fairly well.

The book has four main parts: Part one, deals with "Orientation"; Part two, with "Isms Predominantly Biblical"; Part three, with "Isms both Biblical and Cultural"; Part four, with "Isms Predominantly Cultural." The chapters of the book are called units and there are fourteen of these written by eleven members of the faculty.

Unit One is an apologia for the Bible as the point of reference from which the subject matter of the book is oriented. This, it is stated, is the most

distinctive point of reference for main-line Protestantism. The problem of hermeneutics is discussed and the historical principle is adopted. Historical interpretation, it is maintained, is the attempt to reconstruct the original facts and meanings of a particular passage together with a study of the use made of the passage in subsequent generations. It is to be observed that the sort of historical approach discussed has both objective and subjective elements, and the writer of this unit warns against the dangers lurking in literalism, proof texts, allegorizing, typology and historicism, the last of which is to be understood as largely confined to prolegomena.

Unit Two discusses sects and isms in historical perspective. A sect is defined as a party dissenting from an established or parent church. In contrast, an ism is regarded as a more or less coherent body of doctrine which has not been accepted as official by any established or parent church, but which has not objectified itself into a dissenting party. This definition of an ism makes it possible for some fourteen isms to be discussed within the pages of this book.

Isms described as predominantly biblical are Fundamentalism, Adventism, Dispensationalism and Perfectionism. Isms described as both biblical and cultural are Judaism, Roman Catholicism, Denominationalism and Ecumenism. The healing sects come in for special treatment under the biblical and cultural heading also. Isms described as predominantly cultural are Fascism, Communism, Racism, Naturalism, Scientism, Modernism and Secularism.

Most of the units of the book include the following emphases: a brief historical sketch of the ism, a statement of its characteristic features, an evaluation of the movement, a suggested methodology for facing the ism, suggested projects for further exploration, and a carefully selected bibliography. Indeed, anyone interested in the isms could well spend the price of the book for the sake of the bibliography alone.

As previously stated, the book has a practical rather than a theoretical orientation, and it leaves much to be desired from the point of view of the scholar who wants a book that really comes to grips with the fundamental theoretical issues involved in the isms and sects in their relation to the Church. One must assume that the Church is to be identified with main-line Protestantism. Presbyterianism, Methodism, Lutheranism and Calvinism are not specially treated amongst the isms. For instance, on p. 28, Andrew K. Rule states: "If we feel that we belong in the main-line Protestantism and do not represent a sect, we should not allow that fact to cause any smug self-satisfaction." On p. 157, Kenneth J. Foreman states: "We shall consider Roman Catholicism *a sect of Christianity*." He further assures his readers that Roman Catholicism is surely Christian. "One cannot possibly call it pagan; it is not to be classified with any other religion" (p. 158). To the present reviewer this sounds exceedingly provincial, and, indeed, is indicative of a certain provincialism to be found in several sections of the book.

Since there are fourteen units in the book it would be quite unfair to pass judgment on it on the basis of a few of the units. On the whole the writers seem to have achieved their purpose within the limits they have set themselves. The units are informative and the bibliographies make up for what is lacking in the context.

C. C. Landon

St. John's College
Winnipeg, Manitoba

Jonathan Edwards the Preacher. By Ralph G. Turnbull. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958. Pp. 192. $3.95.

When the Yale University Press recently inaugurated its sumptuous new edition of the works of Jonathan Edwards, it did more than pay tribute to one of the University's most distinguished sons; it acknowledged the important place which he occupies in the history of theological thought. Few would now deny that he was one of the most powerful and original minds that America has produced. The acknowledgment of his significance has been delayed by antipathy and misconceptions. Many of Edwards' characteristic beliefs were repugnant to the pronounced Liberalism current a generation ago, and the salutary disciplines of historical theology had not taught men to see him in his proper perspective, with a frank acknowledgment of his limitations and a proper recognition of his greatness.

In the present theological climate, with the greater awareness of the importance of an historical approach to questions of belief, we may expect an increase in the number of works devoted to Jonathan Edwards. Professor Perry Miller has written a book which is stimulating though not wholly satisfying, and Miss Winslow has given us an attractive study. There is still room for a work which will adequately set forth Edwards' doctrines and assess his contribution to the history of thought. It must frankly be stated that Dr. Turnbull's book is of a much more modest character. His title suggests a study of homiletic method or of sermonic material, and the latter might have led to a serious evaluation of Edwards' theological position. What he has actually given us is a general account of Edwards, with particular emphasis on his work as a preacher. Dr. Turnbull is to be congratulated on the time he has salved from a busy life in order to collect his material. Criticism is more justly directed to his method of presentation than to his diligence in preparation. Roughly 150 pages of text are divided into 30 chapters, some of them less than three pages long. This creates an impression of superficiality, which the material itself does little to dissipate. Dr. Turnbull has impressive academic credentials: he is an Edinburgh graduate and a former professor of Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh. It is surprising, therefore, to find his book marked by peculiarities of style difficult to reconcile with such a background. Prepositions, of course, are notoriously treacherous; but words are inexactly used and sentence structure is often

loose and defective. Perhaps the book was written on a typewriter and not revised with sufficient care. Possibly it was dictated to a secretary: this would explain many of the blemishes, since few of us command so exact a style that we can control the difficult medium of dictation. It would also account for the disproportionately high number of errors, though more careful proof reading would have caught many of these. It must be remembered, however, that the author is the minister of a large city church; and anyone who, amid the pressures of so demanding a task, produces a study of a scholarly subject deserves encouragement.

GERALD R. CRAGG

Andover Newton Theological School
Massachusetts, U.S.A.

The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform. By A. ALLAN MCARTHUR. London: SCM Press (Toronto: Ryerson Press), 1958. Pp. 159. 25/–.

THIS BOOK by a minister of the Church of Scotland is primarily addressed to his "brethren in the ministry of the Church of Scotland and to all who take their stand within the tradition of the Reformation." But it would be a pity indeed if a majority of ministers and educated laymen in this country were to conclude from its Scottish provenance that they can skip the volume. Parts of it were first delivered as papers at *L'Institut de Théologie Orthodoxe* in Paris and at United Church Colleges in Toronto and Kingston in Canada. And Christian Communions which have authorized lectionaries, as well as those which have not, can benefit from the research and considered opinions of the author.

Dr. McArthur started from his own situation under the Lectionary of the Book of Common Order, 1940 (revised 1952). This he judged to be unsatisfactory in that "it is obviously founded upon the Romano-Anglican lectionary tradition which is but one among many ancient systems . . . and these systems do not witness to a total pattern of coherent development."

He proceeded to make a critical study of the evolution of the Christian Year (publishing in 1953 a book with that title) and of the growth of lectionaries. Having come to the conclusion that "the traditional Christian Year is a half-year" (which has been rather haphazardly added to and filled out to complete a whole year) he set himself the formidable task of compiling a lectionary which "would exhibit the entire sequence of the Christian Creed." The resultant lectionary—the Peterhead Lectionary—begins on the first Sunday in October with the Festival of Creation and Harvest Thanksgiving, ordering Genesis 1 as "a most appropriate Harvest lesson." Almost two-thirds of the book is taken up with explanation of, and detailed and clear tables relating to, this Lectionary.

There are four divisions to the book. Part One is entitled "The Christian Year and the Proclamation of the Word of God" and contains some of the author's general principles and constructive suggestions. Noteworthy are his strong criticism of the separation of the ministry of Word and of Sacrament

in many Protestant traditions, with a plea for "recovery of the balance and comprehensiveness of the Early Church . . . recovery of the primitive tension of co-existence, the unity and common centrality of Word and Sacrament"; and his insistence on order in the preaching of the Word. "If we desire to recover the cardinal Reformation principle of order in the proclamation of the Word of God, let us seek that achievement in terms of the order of the Christian Year."

Part Two contains the meat of the author's historical research into ancient lectionaries, and liturgical students may well consider this the most valuable section. Pertinent features of eight lectionary systems—Byzantium (beginning with Easter), Jerusalem, Edessa, Milan, and Rome in its earliest known form (beginning with Epiphany or Christmas), and the Bobbio Missal, the Lectionary of Luxeuil and the Spanish Lectionary of Toledo (beginning with Advent)—are described and set forth.

In Part Three Dr. McArthur explains the theories behind, and the structure of, his proposed lectionary, dedicated to Elders and Members of Peterhead Old Parish Church, of which he was minister and where he tested his work in a parochial setting. What he gives us is a Sunday Lectionary (with provision for Christmas Day and for Holy Week) based on two governing principles—the Christian Year and the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds.

A considered judgment upon his laborious and praiseworthy effort is obviously impossible here; lectionaries, like liturgies, must be used in their proper context of public worship before they can be termed adequate or inadequate. In two or three years' time the author ought to be receiving valid reactions, provided many (for whom it is permissible) study and use in public worship what is here offered.

This reviewer is one who lives daily under "the Romano-Anglican lectionary tradition" and he is not blind to some of its deficiencies and its need of revision. He is happy that recent Roman Catholic reforms have rightly emphasized the priority of the Sunday lections over any possible or previous alternatives. But can "the sanctification of time" be satisfactorily assisted by a lectionary concerned with Sundays only?

And, even in Scotland, the author can hardly expect his simple equation of the cathedra of the *episcopos* with "the parish minister's chair" to be taken by all his readers as proven fact!

GERALD E. MOFFATT

Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Preface to Pastoral Theology: The Ministry and Theory of Shepherding. By SEWARD HILTNER. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958. Pp. 240. $4.00.

THIS TEXT on Pastoral Theology is an attempt to formulate a systematic theology about the ministry of the Pastor, taking into full consideration all the modern insights and methods, both religious and secular, which aid a

fuller understanding of personality and character. Clinical Training and a wider knowledge of the various methods of counselling have led many clergy to make use of them in a manner often haphazard and unrelated to Christian Doctrine. Dr. Hiltner addresses himself to this problem in order to show that the insights of depth psychology, the methods of the counsellor and the development towards wholeness are legitimate tools of the pastor and can be systematically related in Christian Theology.

The Pastor's work is divided into three—Shepherding, Organizing and Communicating. While some space is devoted to a brief consideration of the latter two, the book is mainly concerned with the theory and ministering of "Shepherding." Dr. Hiltner has discarded all the traditional terminology of Pastoral Theology in order to avoid misunderstanding or pre-conceived notions. Shepherding is to be seen from three "perspectives," healing, sustaining and guiding, but even he recognizes the dangers of each word. "Guiding," for example, needs two pages to explain what it looks like but what it does not mean!

One of the very useful things in the book is the use of case histories. Some are provided by Icabod Spencer, a 19th century Presbyterian minister who kept dialogue histories of many of his pastoral calls. Along with these examples of the more traditional type of ministry are examples of modern clinical cases. These give concreteness and a solid basis for the demonstration and criticism of method. They are illuminating and instructive and any pastor can profit from a study of them, especially if, as he reads, he tries to think what he would do under like circumstances. "Healing" is the ministry which leads to fullness of life. Its pre-requisite is knowledge and diagnosis—an understanding of where and why the person is now along with a forward vision of where he ought to be. Healing is to lead him in this way. "Guiding" is to be non-directive in the sense that the person is not told what to do. It is patient and slow listening and questioning until the person himself comes to a right solution of the problem. "Sustaining" means standing by in such a situation as bereavement in which, for the time being, there can be neither healing or guiding.

One misses some traditional concepts in this theology. Moral Theology, Spiritual Direction and discipline receive but brief mention and in general are set aside. This of course comes out of the belief that traditional moral theology is no longer easily applicable in view of the development of character as seen in analysis. There is no reference throughout the book to any pastoral use of any sacramental ministration. In Spencer's cases, prayer is extensively used, although it appears often to be a sort of exhortation to the patient. "I then prayed for about twenty minutes." In the more recent illustrations prayer does not too often appear. Indeed the book stresses beginning with the person where he is. Traditional theology perhaps more often places stress on God and His demands. Both are needed and I feel a lack here.

The language of the book could be sharpened and much of the apology

removed. For example, in one short paragraph we find, "It is our contention that . . ." "But we do argue against . . ." "Indeed, if our concern is . . ." (p. 149). The author's name is on the title page and it seems unnecessary to present his argument in such a manner. I wonder too what Pastor Key makes of the phrase, " . . . and the time consuming and most gracious co-operation of Pastor Key" (p. 154). Three pages later one discovers that it is the slow progress through many interviews which is time consuming. Clinical reports are of necessity slow and discursive but the text proper could be much more direct and concise.

Here, however, is a book which should be read by all who are concerned with integrating and relating our new insights with theology so that the priest and pastor is not just another variety of counsellor but the pastor, wise as a serpent, using every means, and understanding what he is doing in this fundamental work of the ministry.

H. W. Buchner

Edson, Alberta

Segregation and the Bible. By Everett Tilson. Nashville, N.Y.: Abingdon Press, 1958. Pp. 176. $2.50.

The author of the book under review, Everett Tilson, is a Methodist minister and associate professor of biblical theology at Vanderbilt University Divinity School. He holds the degrees of B.D. and Ph.D. from Vanderbilt. He is a contributor to Methodist periodicals and the author of *The Conscience of Culture*. Tilson's knowledge of contemporary theology is impressive and his frequent references to rabbinic lore and Judaism derive from his connection with the Hebrew Union College where he did post-graduate work.

Although he leans to a liberal view of the Scriptures and refuses to "attribute equal authority to all portions of the Bible," he deals gently with those who take a more narrow view, and reasons with them on their own grounds.

The first part of the book attempts to show to those who seek scriptural authority for racial segregation that their proof-texts are exegetically ill-founded. In this part the careful reader will sense something of the author's tactful restraint. To treat mistaken arguments seriously puts an additional strain upon an honest writer and requires considerable grace. This will account for the somewhat flat impression created by this part of the argument. But the reader will be more than rewarded by what follows.

The second part of the book deals with the N.T. attitude to non-Jews; first, on the part of Jesus, then on the part of the Apostles and the early Church. The author concludes: "In teaching 'the love of God for all mankind', Jesus Christ and the Apostles wrought numerous revolutionary changes in the social order."

When we come to the last part of the book we encounter the author at his best. In this part he deals with the implications of biblical faith.

Here the writer speaks no more as a biblical scholar who deals with "texts," but as a humble believer in the atoning sacrifice upon the Cross. He has something to say not only to segregationists whom he knows to be wrong, but also to integrationists whose right rests upon a wrong premise. For him, integration can have no other foundation than the equal dependence of all creatures upon their Creator. This is quite a different basis than a facile humanism based upon a supposed equality of men. The writer knows only too well the fallacy of the proposition that all men are equal, and though he agrees with the Declaration of Independence that "all men are *created* equal," he suggests a more accurate phrasing: "all men are equally created." That God is the Creator of man is the biblical ground for integration. But in the light of the Cross, segregation is not merely a different point of view but rebellion against the will of God who in Jesus Christ shows special concern for the underprivileged.

Characteristically, the writer confines himself to the American situation as encountered in daily life. This gives directness to his message and creates an atmosphere of prophetic earnestness. The author speaks to the Christian conscience of the United States in the context of the Bible. He neither moralizes nor theorizes; he annunciates the Gospel in its practical application to the race crisis in America.

There are several innocent misprints in the text; "spirit" standing for "immorality" is a most unfortunate one (p. 121).

J. Jocz

The Nathaniel Institute
Toronto, Ont.

LIVING AGE BOOKS

New York: Meridian Books (Toronto: Longmans Green & Co.)

Meridian Books of New York have been and are publishing one of the most remarkable series of paper-back classics in theology in our day with authors including such past heroes as Inge, Otto and Troeltsch and such modern "giants" as Tillich, Niebuhr, Barth, Bultmann, Dodd, Cullman and others. Most of these are reprints, though a few (for example the Barth and Bultmann titles below) are originals not appearing elsewhere in English. These titles are all inexpensive, ranging from $1.35 to $1.60 in Canada (about ten cents more than in the U.S.).

The reviewer has chosen about one-half of the published titles for notice below. Not all of these will commend themselves equally to readers—they certainly did not to me—but every one is worth purchasing and reading.

The order in which the books are noted here is simply the order in which they were published. The reviewer would like to express his gratitude to the publishers for sending him this varied collection of books. It has been a treasured experience to reach out for the top book of a pile and be certain of another worthwhile book.

An Interpretation of Christian Ethics. By Reinhold Niebuhr. (LA 1), 1956. Pp. 224. $1.35.

Every budding theologian knows the name of Reinhold Niebuhr. These Rauschenbusch Memorial Lectures for 1934 may sound a bit dated with their allusions to the League of Nations and Hitler Germany, but they are still inspired writing. No one has made a greater impact on American liberal Protestantism than Niebuhr with his insistence on the impossibleness of Jesus' absolute ethic and his realistic appraisal of sin.

Mankind's sin, he insists, is not finiteness but egoism, and the impossible Christian ethical ideal of love not only becomes relevant but in part possible when it is held in tension with justice. This book is an excellent introduction to beginners in Niebuhr.

Christian Mysticism. By W. R. Inge (LA 3), 1956. Pp. xx, 330. $1.35.

After almost sixty years Dean Inge's classic analysis of Christian mysticism remains the brilliantly lucid and learned set of lectures that they were in 1899 when they were first delivered at Oxford as the Bampton Lectures. This is a course of eight lectures which expound mysticism sympathetically both from an historical and theological point of view. There have been later studies by James, Otto, Underhill and Jones, but this book has not been replaced (although corrected in places) by any of these. To anyone interested in understanding such great mystics of the church through the eyes of a sympathetic scholar as St. John, St. Paul, Clement, Augustine, Dionysius, Erigena, Eckhart, Ruysbroek, Suso, Tauler, St. Teresa, St. Juan of the Cross, Fénélon, Pico de Mirandola, Boehme, and a host of others, this book is the *sine qua non* to which one must constantly return.

Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting. By R. Bultmann. Transl. by R. H. Fuller. (LA 4), 1956. Pp. 240. $1.35.

This original Living Age Book is divided into five parts, the first four dealing respectively with the Old Testament heritage, Judaism, the Greek heritage, and Hellenism. A final section deals with primitive Christianity itself. Bultmann sees the early church growing out of an O.T. and Jewish background but strongly influenced by Stoicism (in St. Paul), the Mystery Religions and Gnosticism (especially St. John). Particularly regarding man's situation in the world and in its doctrine of redemption was Christianity strongly colored by Gnostic conceptions.

Bultmann is certainly a controversial figure among N.T. scholars. To those, however, who expect "demythologizing" to be made simple, this book will be a disappointment. After all, that is not the topic with which he is dealing. But to those who feel that the rise of Christianity can better be understood against the background of conflicting forces and influences in first century Palestine, the book will be most instructive.

The Descent of the Dove: A History of the Holy Spirit in the Church. By Charles Williams. Introd. by W. H. Auden. (LA 5), 1956. Pp. xv, 240. $1.35.

I suppose, like Gaul, readers will be divided into three parts: those who admire Williams, those who don't, and those who haven't read him. Since I belonged to the last part, I was naturally curious about this friend of C. S. Lewis and W. H. Auden. But I am no longer curious; I now belong to the second part.

I suppose I shall now be branded as one of the *illiterati* by Williams' admirers, but after 240 pages I still do not know what co-inherence is, nor what Irenaeus' well-known phrase "My Eros is crucified" means. (I thought I knew what Irenaeus meant, but the Williams refrain leaves me baffled.) Nor have I learned to enjoy references to the "*Theos* of the Divine Ambiguity," "the Way of Affirmation of Images," "the Equity of Redemption," or "the image of the Identity of dying Man." Such terms seem overly precious. In spite of such irritants the literary ability of Williams is always apparent. I can understand the admirers; I simply cannot join them.

The Religious Situation. By Paul Tillich. Transl. by H. R. Niebuhr. (LA 6), 1956. Pp. 219. $1.35.

For Tillich religion is "direction toward the Unconditioned" and the modern situation in the West is the culture of a capitalist society. In various aspects of civilization—science, art, politics, ethics and religion—a religious revolt has been taking place due to what he calls a "belief-ful realism," a kind of "total attitude toward reality."

This book first appeared in 1926 when Tillich was philosophy professor at Frankfurt-am-Main. Its English edition (1932) has long been out of print. Thirty years later these lectures are still a penetrating analysis of the contemporary religious situation.

The Meaning of Paul for Today. By C. H. Dodd (LA 8), 1957. Pp. 190. $1.35.

The name of Dodd is known to every N.T. student as one of the most influential British scholars of modern times. Not so well-known is a little book on Paul which he wrote almost 40 years ago. In a series of 12 short studies he attempts to explain Pauline thought against a first century background to a modern generation. Dodd is enthusiastic about Paul's significance, but there are times when the Paul he writes about seems more Dodd than Paul. Dodd is certainly a fine scholar, but one fears that the mysticism of Paul has in his book become intellectualized overly much.

Martin Luther: Road to Reformation. By H. BOEHMER. Transl. from the German by J. W. DOBERSTEIN and T. G. TAPPERT (LA 9), 1957. Pp. xiii, 449. $1.60.

The discovery of a number of Luther manuscripts some fifty years ago brought about a renaissance of Luther studies of which Boehmer's *Der junge Luther* is undoubtedly the best known. When it first appeared in English in 1946 it was immediately greeted with acclaim. Boehmer traces the development of Luther from childhood through the Diet of Worms up to his seclusion in the Wartburg castle. Here the narrative ends since "the rest of his life can be viewed only as part of a larger movement and not as that of an isolated personality."

The Social Sources of Denominationalism. By H. RICHARD NIEBUHR (LA 11), 1957. Pp. x, 304. $1.45.

Although this book was first published in 1929, it is still the book to read on denominationalism in the U.S. as rooted in social and economic factors. In the wake of Troeltsch, Weber, Tawney and others Niebuhr is inclined to consider divided Christianity as due more to sociological than to theological factors. Such forces as economic class level, regionalism, nationalism, immigrant status, and color are understood as dominant in creating separate churches and sects. The wound in the body of Christ is thus the great sin of our society.

One suspects that Niebuhr would today rewrite the last chapter ("Ways to Unity"), but very little else. In fact, little else ought to be rewritten. Anyone wanting to understand American Christianity must ponder this study carefully.

Christian Thought: Its History and Application. By ERNST TROELTSCH. (LA 12), 1957. Pp. 191. $1.35.

The voice of Ernst Troeltsch sounds like a voice from the dead past. His great work, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches and Groups*, will of course remain as a landmark in Christian scholarship. But to read this book is to revive an era that is gone, the era of liberalism in German theological thinking in the early part of this century.

The book contains five lectures, the first, on "The Place of Christianity Among the World Religions," was to be given at Oxford, the next three on "Ethics and the Philosophy of History," for the University of London, and the last on "Politics, Patriotism, Religion," for the London Society for the Study of Religion. Troeltsch died before he could deliver them, and others read the lectures in his place. The lectures were edited, together with an introduction, by Baron F. von Hügel.

Leaves from the Notebooks of a Tamed Cynic. By REINHOLD NIEBUHR. (LA 13), 1957. Pp. 225. $1.35.

When Niebuhr graduated from theology as a young man of 23 he became pastor of a small church in Detroit where he remained for thirteen years until 1928, when he joined the staff of Union Theological Seminary in New York. These "Leaves" are small vignettes of reflection taken from his pastoral notebooks of these years. For decades Niebuhr has served as the conscience of North American Protestantism. In these "Leaves" one can trace the development of a prophet stirred by the lack of ethical perception in the Christian church.

This was the first time I had ever read the book, and I was sorry that I had not discovered it years ago. While reading it I was constantly reminded of Kierkegaard's *Diaries* and his *For Self-Examination.* It is the kind of book that pricks your conscience. In fact, it is an excellent book. Every preacher should read it for the good of his soul and his ministry.

Mysticism East and West: A Comparative Analysis of the Nature of Mysticism. By R. OTTO. Transl. by B. L. BRACEY and R. C. PAYNE. (LA 14), 1957. Pp. xvii, 262. $1.60.

Rudolf Otto was considered by many as the outstanding Western exponent of Indian and German mysticism. His broad scholarship and careful analysis are well illustrated in this classic comparative study of Shankara in his commentaries on the Upanishads and on the Bhagavad Gītā and of Meister Eckhart in his *Opus tripartitum.* The larger part of the book traces their similarities, whereas Part B deals with the differences. Both men seek salvation either through the inward way of introspection or through the *via imitationis.* Both oppose occultism, emotional experimentalism, eroticism and Nature mysticism. Both seek to void creatureliness or Māyā. Both have a common theistic foundation.

And yet in a sense East is East, and West is West. Eckhart's mysticism is rooted in Palestine, in Christian theology, in life. Shankara's mysticism is Indian, and the *summum bonum* is static, unchanging. Particularly evident is this difference in the ethical content of the two systems. For Shankara the redeemed is removed from works; for Eckhart unity with Being blossoms in a new obedience.

Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr. A Historical and Theological Essay. By O. CULLMANN. Transl. by F. V. FILSON. (LA 21), 1958. Pp. 252. $1.45.

Cullmann has one of the most productive pens among N.T. scholars. Particularly well-known is his *Christ and Time.* This book, called *Peter,* is divided into two parts; the first is a historical survey of what is known of Peter in the threefold capacity listed in the title. The pickings are naturally

meagre and at times the author tends to be overly repetitious. Especially interesting, however, is his survey of liturgical sources and of the excavations under St. Peter's in Rome in the section on "Peter the Martyr."

Of greater interest is the excellent theological essay which constitutes the second half of the book. This deals exegetically and doctrinally with Matt. 16:17ff. Cullmann believes that the original setting of the verses may have been Jesus' institution of the Lord's Supper, that the "rock" refers to the person of Peter rather than to his confession, that Jesus' reference is to Peter's brief rule over the primitive church in its infancy at Jerusalem after which this was given over to James, Peter becoming a missionary, and finally that neither a transference of this rule or of an *apostolic* succession is historically or theologically justified. This is a most worthwhile book.

The Faith of the Church: A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed according to Calvin's Catechism. By KARL BARTH. Ed. by J. L. LEUBA, and transl. by G. VAHANIAN. (LA 22), 1958. Pp. 188. $1.35. Cloth binding at $3.50.

This is not a reprint but an original publication. A series of six seminars was held by Barth on the first part of Calvin's Catechism (the part dealing with the Apostles' Creed) to the pastors of the Val-de-Travers at Neuchâtel from 1940 to 1943. These lectures were stenographically recorded and published with the author's approval. Professor Vahanian of Princeton University has translated them into English for this series.

Karl Barth is the most influential theologian of this century. He has been accused of many things. Conservatives have called his theology a "new modernism," and liberals have called it fundamentalism in dialectic dress. Barth himself is impatient with all such labels, especially with the label of Barthian. Barth views his task as that of Christian witness. He is a redeemed sinner testifying to God's work in Christ in him as a member of the Church of Christ. Unless one understands this, one can never appreciate his writing, whether it be his voluminous *Die kirchliche Dogmatik* or his work on Mozart.

The reader who reads this book in order to gain an outline of Barth's system of theology (of course it is not a system!) will be disappointed. But whoever reads it sympathetically as a witness to the faith of the church by a simple saint will be refreshed and his faith will be stimulated.

JOHN WM. WEVERS

University College
University of Toronto

S.C.M.

BOOK ROOM

SPECIAL SUMMER OFFER

By referring to this advertisement, you can order any single book at 25% discount. *This offer is valid until August 15th.*

THE FOLLOWING TITLES AVAILABLE AT 50% OFF THE PRICE LISTED during same period:

HOCKING Meaning of Immortality in Human Experience	$3.50
RAMSEY, ED. Faith & Ethics. Theology of H. R. Niebuhr	$5.00
FOSDICK What is Vital in Religion	$3.00
" Living of These Days	$4.00
STEERE Time to Spare	$2.50
" Work & Contemplation	$2.50
KIRK, ED. Apostolic Ministry	$5.50
CROWE Getting Help from the Bible	$2.95
MCCRACKEN Making of the Sermon	$2.00
Cox St. Matthew (Torch Series)	$2.00

Robert Miller, Book Steward.

S.C.M. BOOK ROOM,
23 St. Thomas St.,
Toronto 5.

VOCATION AND MINISTRY

by RT. REV. F. R. BARRY
BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL

The Chairman of the Recruitment Committee of the Church of England has a clear and vigorous approach to the problems of finding and training men for the ministry. His conclusions are highly controversial, emphasizing the importance of the theological and pastoral questions that must be answered.

"Refreshingly honest and free from pious cant."—
The Church of England Newspaper

$2.35

THE COPP CLARK
Publishing Co. Ltd.
517 Wellington St. West, Toronto

For Your Idyll Moments

CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE
Tamberlaine the Great, Doctor Faustus, The Jew of Malta, Edward the Second. $1.60

JOHN DRYDEN
The Conquest of Granada, Marriage a la Mode, Aureng-Zebe. $1.70

OLIVER GOLDSMITH
The Good Natur'd Man, She Stoops to Conquer, An Essay on the Theatre, A Register of Scotch Marriage. $1.50

GEORGE BERNARD SHAW
by G. K. Chesterton $1.10
The Examined Life by W. Fife $2.15
Japanese Theatre by F. Bowers $2.65
The Emperor's Clothes by K. Nott $2.15
The Moral Decision by E. Cahn $2.15

Complete Catalogue available on request to:

THE COPP CLARK
Publishing Co. Limited
517 Wellington St. West, Toronto 2B